THE LONDON PARISH CLERGY
IN THE
REIGN OF ELIZABETH I.

H. GARETH OWEN

Thesis submitted in the Faculty of Arts of the
University of London for the
Degree of the Doctor of Philosophy
1957

ABSTRACT OF THESIS.

This thesis sets out to portray the pastoral standards, conditions, and aspirations of the London parish clergy in the Elizabethan period. The first two chapters are concerned with their social and geographical backgrounds; they are followed by chapters dealing with educational, preaching, and residential standards. Prospects of preferment are discussed in Chapter VI which treats upon the subtle mechanism of clerical patronage. Three subsequent chapters help to explain the attraction of London to the aspiring cleric. Rectorial income and expenditure are analysed, and the increase in gross income during the period explored; the endless controversy over tithe is assessed. Discussed in detail are the parish lectureships, lucrative sources of augmentation of clerical income. The multifarious opportunities for unbeneficed ministers in the capital are brought out, and the comparative comfort of the preaching curate is contrasted with the indigence of his less-qualified counterpart.

Finally, the course of clerical nonconformity is traced in two concluding chapters. The first assesses the strength of the movement in the early years of the reign under the leadership of the ex-Marian exiles, and its disruption by Parker in the vestiarian controversy. Chapter XI dwells upon the fluctuations of the radical movement post-1566, emphasising the

ever-widening gap between the mass of parish clergy and the Puritan nucleus holding lectureships, or positions in the Minories, the most important nonconformist enclave in the city. A section on Bishop Aylmer's disciplinary activities helps to explain the virtual eclipse of organised clerical radicalism by 1592.

The appendices are composed largely of biographical data, including additions to Hennessy's lists of London clergy.

"This office requireth a perfect man to teach, govern, and guide this learned and wise people: this great and large diocese doth wish for one furnished as Samuel, or rather as Solomon, with all graces and gifts of learning, policy, wisdom and knowledge of things belonging both to God and man."

(Edwin Sandys at Paul's Cross, on his entry to the bishopric of London in 1570, The Sermons of Sandys, ed. J.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1842), 330.)

"O London, thou hast cause to weepe,
For to consider thyne estate:
Thou art in synne now drounde so deepe,
That from hell mouthe thou canst no scape,
Except repentaunce thou embrace,
At Gods hande thou shalt finde no grace."

(J.Carr, A larume Bell for London (1573),Sig.A.iv.f.lv)

"There is good cause the Citie of London should become an other Thessalonica, in seeking and honouring our Phisition Christ Jesus. There is so much Preaching, and so diligent hearing, that needs there must be some following."

(W.Fisher, A Sermon preached at Paules Cross (1580), f.2r.).

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements are due, first and foremost, to my past and present supervisors, Sir John Neale, and Mr. J. Hurstfield, for their patient guidance. I owe much to the counsels of Professor Glanmor Williams, Dr. P. Collinson, and Mr. E.L.C. Mullins, and to the stimulus of the Elizabethan seminar at the Institute of Historical Research. Without the unflagging co-operation of Dr. A.E. Hollaender, and Mr. A. Ridge, much of the material used for this study would have remained inaccessibl My debt to the recent pioneer works of Miss D.M. Barratt and Mr. Christopher Hill will be frequently apparent.

ABBREVIATIONS

Addit. MS.	Additional Manuscript (British Museum).
Alumni Cantab.	Alumni Cantabrigienses, Pt.1 (to 1718), ed. J. and J.A.Venn, 4 vols. (Cambridge 1922-7).
Alumni Oxon.	Alumni Oxonienses,1500-1714, ed. J.Foster, 4 vols. (Oxford 1891-2)
APC.	Acts of the Privy Council, ed. J.Dasent.
BM.	British Museum.
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Burn	R.Burn, Ecclesiastical Law, 4 vols. (1797 edition).
Card. Doc. Annals	E.Cardwell, Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England, 2 vols. (Oxford 1844).
Card. Synod.	E.Cardwell, Synodalia, 2 vols. (Oxford 1842)
CUL.	Cambridge University Library.
Cons. Ct.	Consistory Court.
CWA.	Church-Wardens' Accounts.
Dale	T.C.Dale (ed.), The Inhabitants of London in 1638, 1 (1931).
DNB.	Dictionary of National Biography, ed. L.Stephen and S.Lee (1908-11 re-issue).
GLMS.	Guildhall Library Manuscript.
Henn.	G.Hennessy, Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense (1898)
Hill	C.Hill, Economic Problems of the Church From Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament (Oxford 1956)
HMC.	Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports.

Lansd. MS.	Lansdowne Manuscript (British Museum).
LCCRO.	London County Council Record Office (County Hal
LCRO.	London Corporation Record Office (Moorgate).
Le Neve	J.Le Neve, and T.D.Hardy, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanæ, 3 vols.(Oxford 1854).
Lib. Act.	Liber Actorum (Consistory Court).
Lib. Corr.	Liber Correctionis (Consistory Court).
Lib. Examin.	Liber Examinationis Testium ac Partium Principalium (Consistory Court).
Lib. VG.	Liber Vicarii Generalis
Mullins	E.L.C.Mullins, The Effects of the Marian and Elizabethan Religious Settlements Upon the Clergy of London, 1553-1564 (Unpublished M.A. thesis London 1948).
Newcourt	R.Newcourt, Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense, 2 vols. (1708-10).
OED.	Oxford English Dictionary.
PC.	Perpetual Curate.
PCC.	Prerogative Court of Canterbury.
PRO.	Public Record Office
R.	Rector.
Rep.	Repertories.
SP.	State Papers.
SP.	A.Peel (ed.), The Seconde Parte of a Register, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1915).
STC.	A.W.Pollard and G.R.Redgrave (eds.), A Short-Title Catalogue of Books...1475-1640 (1926)
Strype, Aylmer	J.Strype, Historial Collections of the Life and Acts of...John Aylmer (Oxford 1821 edition)

Strype, Grindal	J.Strype, The History of the Life and Acts of ...Edmund Grindal (Oxford 1821 edition).
Strype, Parker	J.Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, 3 vols. (Oxford 1821 edition).
Strype, Whitgift	J.Strype, The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, 3 vols. (Oxford 1822 edition).
V.	Vicar.
VCH.	W.Page (ed.), The Victoria History of London, 1 (1909)
VE.	Valor Ecclesiasticus, i (1810)
VM.	Vestry Minutes

The New Style in dating has been adopted throughout. Contractions in transcripts have been extended. Otherwise, spelling, capitalisation, and punctuation have been kept as close to the originals as possible.

INTRODUCTION

The archipelago of ecclesiastical islands that constituted Elizabethan London, requires careful navigation. A number of ecclesiastical authorities exercised rights in the city. Chief of them was the bishop of London, his jurisdiction covering ninety-three of the 111 parish churches under study.[1] Many of his powers were delegated long before the Elizabethan period. He seldom presided in person in his consistory court, the diocesan court located in St. Paul's. The judgement of suits within the competence of that court was delegated to the official principal, a civil lawyer, who was invariably a layman by the Elizabethan period. Other purely spiritual functions, visitatorial and corrective, were delegated to the vicar-general of the diocese. So closely associated were the two offices, that they were in fact held by the same person, described in that capacity as the chancellor, during the Elizabethan period. Powers reserved to the bishop or his clerical suffragan, were those like ordination, confirmation, consecration of churchyards and chapels, that required

---

1. This total does not include St. Katherine Hospital, a non-parochial institution, Lamb's chapel, a hermitage bequeathed in 1574 to the Clothworkers' Company, and St. Mary Axe, united to the contiguous parish of St. Andrew Undershaft in 1562. A list of the 111 parish churches within the area under study is given in Appendix D.

episcopal orders.[1]

The bishop's powers over the admission of incumbents to the ninety-three London parishes within his jurisdiction, were less complete. The majority of the incumbents held presentative rectories or vicarages, and thus were admitted by the orthodox process of presentation by the patron to the bishop for institution and a mandate of induction. Others were collated by the bishop, being both patron and the ordinary, but seventeen livings were in the collation of the dean and chapter of St. Paul's who admitted without episcopal intervention. Twelve others were perpetual curacies, a species whose rectorial income was alienated, and whose incumbent was a stipendiary minister with no freehold tenure. The donation was vested in the impropriator or appropriator. Technically, they were not benefices at all, and appointments could be made witho the intervention of the bishop or any diocesan official beyond the issue of a licence to serve the cure.

The inferior jurisdiction of the archdeacon covered, with one exception, the same parochial territory in London as that of his bishop.[2] All but three of the parishes for which he was responsible, fell wholly or in part within the City bars; the exceptions were the

---

1. This account is drawn from Burn,ii,289, and from A. Hamilton Thompson, The English Clergy and their Organisation in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford 1947), 46-9, 51-6.
2. The exception was St. Botolph Bishopsgate, en episcopal peculiar.

three out-parishes of St. James Clerkenwell, St. Mary Islington, and St. Leonard Shoreditch, within the archdeaconry, but outside the jurisdiction of the City government, and therefore not subject to the same tithe regulations. The archdeacon enjoyed visitatorial rights, and corrective powers over laity and clergy, but his probate jurisdiction was limited. The wills of small-propertied parishioners of fifty parishes were proved in the commissary court of London and the deaneries of Middlesex and Barking, one of several such courts within the diocese that were intended to supplement the archidiaconal courts.[1] Located at Paul's Chain, the commissary court of London at one time exercised disciplinary powers in the parishes subject to it,[2] and may, as often happened elsewhere, have seriously rivalled the archidiaconal court. By the Elizabethan period, however, its corrective functions had considerably declined; in fact, it appears to have been concerned only with matters relating to testamentary business, and an occasional matrimonial suit.[3] It became a favourite retreat for ecclesiastical judges relieved of more arduous duties in the consistorial court of the diocese.[4]

---

1. For a list of the parishes, see Newcourt, 1,57.
2. Some late fifteenth-century correction books of the court survive, and are deposited in the Guildhall.
3. Only one court book (1581-93) survives for the Elizabethan period, and this is composed almost entirely of testamentary litigation (GLMS. 9585).
4. Thomas Huick and John Hamond both became responsible for the London commissary court on relinquishing their posts as chancellors in 1570 and 1577, respectively.

Eighteen London parishes were exempt from episcopal, archidiaconal, or commissarial jurisdiction. St. Peter in the Tower, variously described as a perpetual curacy and, - probably more accurately, - a rectory, was a royal peculiar.[1] St. Helen's Bishopsgate, St. Giles Cripplegate, St. Faith, and St. Gregory were peculiars of the dean and chapter of St. Paul's who collated their incumbents, proved the wills of parishioners, and exercised visitatorial rights. Similar rights were claimed in certain precincts within the archdeaconry, the principal ones being Norton Folgate, Portpool, and Hoxton.[2]

The most considerable enclave was formed by the deanery of Arches, the thirteen churches within the City that were archiepiscopal peculiars. Seven of these were in the collation of the archbishop, the remainder being presentative rectories in the gift of the dean and chapter of Canterbury. Visitatorial, corrective, and testamentary jurisdiction was exercised by the dean of the Arches, a nominee of the archbishop, whose court sat in the church of St. Mary le Bow.

The juxtaposition of jurisdictions in the capital city determined not only the course of much of its ecclesiastical history, but also the study of that history. Where judicial authority was so dispersed, the records of judicial proceedings

---

1. It is described as a rectory in the clerical subsidy rolls (e.g. E.179/43/298).
2. Newcourt, 1,57-8. Wills of inhabitants of St Martin le Grand were proved in the court of the dean and chapter of Westminster

have been decentralised, and often assumed to have been subsequently destroyed. Students of its ecclesiastical activity have long laboured under R.G.Usher's misapprehension that "Puritan zeal plus the Great Fire effectually wiped out the story of the diocese of London".[1] A different tale can now be told, and it is possible that neglect within the last forty years has caused more serious loss than the Puritans and the Great Fire put together.[2] Happily, much survives, and is now deposited in recognised diocesan registries at the County Hall and the Guildhall.

Consistorial court records are of two principal types.[3] One relates to Instance cause activity, the equivalent approximately to a civil cause in a secular court, and is composed on the one hand of the libels, responses, interrogatories, depositions, assignations, and sentences, interlocutory as well as final, and on the other, of the act books that recorded the various stages of a case. The latter collection is fairly complete for Elizabethan London; the remainder, with the substantial exception of the deposition books, is negligible.

---

1. R.G.Usher, Reconstruction of the English Church (New York 1910), ii,383.
2. For a list of records surviving in 1914, see Royal Commission on Public Records, Second Report (1914), Appendix, 199-200.
3. A summary of consistorial court records is given by J.S. Purvis, An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records (1953), 64-95. For an exhaustive treatment of consistory court procedure, see F.S.Hockaday, The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester, Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc. xlvi (1924), 197-287.

Even so, they provide a wealth of evidence about tithe disputes in the city as well as detailed biographical information about lay and clerical witnesses. The second major type of record relates to the Ex Officio cause, cases of correction undertaken by the judge on his own behalf (Ex officio mero), on behalf of others (Ex officio promoto), or following presentments made at episcopal visitations. Records are necessarily barer because such cases were very often dealt with summarily, without recourse to the plenary proceedings of an Instance cause. They are also much more fragmentary, surviving only for the years 1583-6, and 1601-2. The information they contain about various aspects of clerical irregularities makes the loss of the remainder all the more deplorable.

Singularly ill-proportioned would be a picture of ministerial activity based on the indiscretions of a minority; the survival of non-judicial records allows for a more balanced representation of the harmony of daily clerical routine. The episcopal registers for the period are predominantly institution books, but their sparseness is compensated by the survival, - rare among diocesan archives -, of the vicar-general's books. Judicial acts are sometimes included, but the series is primarily an administrative record of diocesan activities, ranging from copies of commissions issued under the seal of the High Commission or of the bishop, to faculties licensing

preachers, teachers, and curates. Supplementing these are the Call books drawn up at Episcopal visitations, with their lists of parish officials, clerical as well as lay, and, in the later part of the reign, entries of ministerial credentials and their instruments of office.

Records of the complementary jurisdictions of the dean of the Arches and the dean and chapter of St. Paul's are very meagre for this period, as, with the exception of testamentary matters, are those of the inferior courts in the city. Where parochial records survive, however, this loss is not irreparable. Vestry minutes provide the principal source for a study of that Elizabethan ~~phenomenon~~ innovation, the parish lecturer. Church-wardens' accounts curtly but reliably reflect judicial proceedings affecting the parish. If the revenues of the living were leased by the parishioners either from their clerical or impropriate rector, the accounts indicate the real value of the benefice far more accurately than official assessments. On the parochial level, the most spectacular as well as the rarest record are the memoranda books of the parish clerk of St. Botolph without Aldgate that continue, with slight interruptions, from 1584 to 1600. All the minutiae of parochial life, from the cause of death and cost of burial of inhabitants, and the names of preachers at sermons and lectures, to citations against allegedly criminous or tithe-defaulting parishioners, are here faithfully recorded. Few documents could give a more

vivid representation of the vitality of ecclesiastical activity during these years.

Fortified by the miscellaneous items that have found their way into the national archives, these provide the principal sources, used largely for the first time, for a study of the parish clergy in Elizabethan London. Sufficient grounds for such a study can perhaps be found in Canon Roger Lloyd's remark that "...the real history of the Church of England is therefore made in its parish churches, and the parish priest is the pivot on which that history turns."[1] London, "a mighty arm and instrument to bring any great desire to effect, if it may be won to a man's devotion,"[2] thrusts itself as the obvious target for a local study, with over a hundred parishes within the square mile of the City, and a population that may have been anything between 100,000 and 120,000 by the end of the sixteenth century.[3] "Tudor despotism," said Professor Pollard, "consisted largely in London's dominance over the rest of England";[4] Heylyn, for

---

1. R.Lloyd, The Church of England in the Twentieth Century (194 i, 7.
2. An Apology for the City (c.1575), quoted by Elizabeth Jeffries Davis, The Transformation of London, Tudor Studies (1924), ed R W Seton-Watson (1924), 288
3. One estimate puts it at 80,000-100,000 at the end of Mary's reign (P.Hughes, The Reformation in England, iii (1954), 50). N.G.Brett-James conjectures the population of Shakespeare's London to be 100,000 (The Growth of Stuart London (1935), 27). For other estimates, see F.P.Wilson, The Plague in Shakespeare's London (Oxford 1927), 209-15.
4. Quoted by Miss Davis, loc.cit. 287.

one, believed that this could be applied to clerical affairs.[1]

Ecclesiastically, this dominance was more theoretical than actual. The London ministry is best studied not as a key but a contrast to the situation elsewhere. Contemporaries were well aware of the gulf. "But surely," exclaimed Edward Bush at Paul's Cross, "when I come out of the cuntry hither to the City, methink I come into another world, even out of darkness into light, for here the word of God is plentifully preached."[2] The academic and preaching qualifications of the beneficed clergy of London bore no relation to conditions elsewhere. The frailty of nonconformist tendencies in their ranks contrasts sharply with the outright radicalism of Essex and East Anglian incumbents. London is best viewed as a reservoir that drained, without re-nourishing, the rural sources from which it drew its supply of talent. "Trulye I maye saye london for religion is an earthely parradise to this place," wrote Thomas Turton from Germany,[3] a paradise that the most devoted rural diocesan administrators could not hope to emulate within the existing conditions of the established church.

No more salutary prologue to a study that is basically social and administrative, that deals with the outward forms of

---

1. The practice of London, he said, was pleaded by other towns "...for vestries, lectures and some other innovations." (P. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (1668), 282).
2. Edward Bush, A Sermon preached at Pauls crosse (1576), Sig. F.ii, f.1 v.
3. Turton to Humphrey Newman, 12th October, 1588 (Addit.MS. 28,571, f.165r.).

what to many was an inward calling, can be quoted than Canon Lloyd's introduction to his own account of the church and its ministers:

"To tell the story of the Christian action within and upon history, is not necessarily to have given the least account of what the Church is in itself. But no account of what an institution does can really be intelligible to those who have no idea what it is."[1]

This study follows on from Mr.E.L.C.Mullins' indispensable work on the effects of the Marian and Elizabethan settlements on the London clergy,[2] and is not therefore concerned with the changes, and the reasons for the changes, of incumbents between 1558-60. Consequently, there is no discussion of Roman Catholic nonconformity among the Elizabethan incumbents, for after 1561 only one suspected case of such leanings has been traced.[3]

---

1. Lloyd, op.cit. i,1.
2. E.L.C.Mullins, The Effects of the Marian and Elizabethan Settlements upon the Clergy of London 1553-64 (Unpublished M.A. thesis, London 1948).
3. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1577-9, f.20r.

CHAPTER ONE

SOCIAL ORIGINS.

Few remarks have so provoked church historians as Macaulay's dismissal of the Anglican clergy of the 1560-1660 period as "... on the whole, a plebeian class".[1] Nineteenth-century Tory historians, rushing to the defence of the clergy, were disputed by their Whig counterparts, the most judicious of whom summed up thus:-

> "It is clear that Macaulay greatly understated the number of men of good family that entered the Church, and his picture is, perhaps, in other respects a little over-coloured, but the passages I have cited are, I think, quite sufficient to establish its substantial accuracy."[2]

Nor have more modern scholars arrived at greater unaminity; C.H.Firth's scepticism of what he called Macaulay's "rhetorical extravagance"[3] has been substantiated by F.W.Brooks' conclusions on the social position of the Elizabethan clergy in Lincoln diocese,[4] but has not received wholehearted corroboration from Miss Barratt's studies of the Oxford and Worcester diocesan

---

1. Lord Macaulay, The History of England From the Accession of James II, ed. T.F.Henderson. (1907), 85.
2. W.E.H.Lecky, quoted by Sir Charles Firth, A Commentary on Macaulay's History of England. (1938), 130-1. For other views see ibid 129-30.
3. Ibid. 130.
4. F.W.Brooks, The Social Position of the Parson in the Sixteenth Centuyy, Journal of the British Archaeological Soc., 3rd.series, x, 23-37.

ministry of the post-Reformation period.[1] According to the latest church historian, "the overwhelming majority of the clergy came from the middle and lower classes of society, and could have come from nowhere else."[2] It remains to be seen how far the London clergy conformed to Macaulay's type, or to what extent the opportunities peculiar to that city served to attract ministers of exceptional social and educational rank.

Complaints of the social inferiority of the Elizabethan clergy were as rife among contemporaries as among later commentators. Early in the reign, Bishop Jewel protested against the spoliation of ecclesiastical revenues by patrons and impropriators. Promising young men, he argued, deterred by such alienation, "...are weary and discouraged, they change their studies: some become prentices, some turn to physic, some to law: all shun and flee the ministry."[3] Much the same complaint was made by Henry Smith, the 'silver-tongued' preacher of St. Clement Danes, in 1590; only the "meaner and poorer sort" were left in the ministry, lamented John Stockwood in his Paul's Cross sermon of 1579.[4] While all parties agreed that the contempt of the ministry resulted from the ordination of ignorant and irresponsible men "...of the basest of the people,

---

1. Miss D.M.Barratt, The Condition of the Parish Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester and Gloucester. (D.Phil. Oxford 1949),27.
2. Hill, 209.
3. The Works of John Jewel, ed. H.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1847), ii, 1012.
4. Quoted by Hill, 208.

[of] base occupation and trades, whence they have taken them, some having bene Shoemakers, Barbers, Tailers, even water-bearers, shepheards, and horse keapers..."[1] their reasons for ordaining such men varied somewhat.

To William Harrison, the reluctance of the "more excellent wits" to enter the ministry came from a fear "...lest they should in time not get their bread by the same",[2] a sentiment shared by members of the hierarchy as well as by Puritan controversialists of his generation. The poverty-stricken church was particularly vulnerable to the competition that came from the "...estate of common lawyers...grown so great, so rich and so proud that no other sort dare meddle with them".[3] The lucrative prospects of a career in the Common Law explained, at least to the satisfaction of William Day, Provost of Eton, why "...there is nowe none but the hault and lame put to the ministry..."; the 'pregnant witts' were removed from the universities "...after they had benn their a whill and sent into the lawes of the Realme wher as their is such a nomber as I understand that the howses cannot receaue them,"[4] So perturbed was Day that he advocated further regulation of the number

---

1. A generall Supplication made to Parliament,1586 (SP.,ii,77).
2. Harrison's Description of England, ed. F.J.Furnivall (1877).
3. Thomas Wilson, quoted by J.E.Neale, The Elizabethan House of Commons (1949), 306. Wilson's grievance was that of a civilian lawyer.
4. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10, f.53r. Day's grievances were aired at a sermon delivered at Paul's Cross in 1566, the contents of which were written down in summary form by a listener.

of students admitted into the Inns of Court at any one time.

Not all observers were content with these conventional explanations. A 'maimed ministry', as John Walsall called it,[1] may in the early years of the reign have been an inevitable consequence of the removal of non-subscribing Catholic priests, when the shortage of available ministers obliged the bishops to ordain "...sundry artificers and others, not traded and brought up in learning,...some that were of base occupation."[2] But such conditions did not long endure. Latimer in 1549 could lament of Cambridge that "Ther be few do study divinitie...Ther be none but greate mens sonnes in Colledges, and theyr fathers loke not to have them preachers,"[3] and Oxenbridge, preaching at Paul's Cross in 1566 could claim that there were no more than half a dozen preachers in Oxford[4] - "I except strawbery preachers which come once in the year".-- But the drift of the intelligentsia to more remunerative occupations had been at least partially checked by the middle of the Elizabethan reign. John Walsal[5] and John Keltridge,[6] the one a recent Oxford graduate, the other of Cambridge, both testified in the late 1570s to the abundance of ministers at the universities eking away their time in anticipation of preferment. John Dove,

---

1. A Sermon Preached at Paul's Cross, 5 Oct. 1578 (1578) f.4r
2. Correspondence of Matthew Parker 1535-1575, ed. J.Bruce, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1853), 120.
3. Quoted in Harrison's Description, 21, note 2.
4. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50, 10, f.35r.
5. In his Paul's Cross Sermon, f.4v.
6. In The Exposition and Readynges of John Keltridge; a Sermon madebefore...Aylmer 1577 (1578), 239.

recalling his own experience somewhat later, bore out this picture and his explanation illustrates the predicament confronting the more scrupulous type of ordinand of that age.[1]

> "Myself", he says, "among many other of both the universities, had set my heart at rest, as one resolved to die within the precinctes of the colledge, like a monke shut up in his cell, or an heremite mured up within the compasse of a wall, without hope of ever being called to any ecclesiastical preferment in this corrupt and simonaicall age, had I not been by your honour [Thomas Egerton] preferred."

Unreliable - and often inconsistent - though these contemporary generalisations may be, they provide some guidance to the status of the Elizabethan clergy that can be tested by a close study of a limited area. How far did the religious change of 1559 affect the social position of London incumbents of succeeding generations? Was the acute shortage of ministers in the universities in the early years of the reign, and the apparent revival of recruiting strength by the 1580s, reflected in a fluctuation in the class status of the parish clergyman of the subsequent decade? In short, how valid for London was the contemporary allegation that the spoliation of ecclesiastica revenues by the covetousness of impropriators and the malpractice of lay patrons was producing a body of clergy base in birth and plebeian in character?

"Far too little is known of the social classes from which

---

1. A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1596), f.iv.

the clergy (and their wives) were drawn", T.S.Willan recently lamented.[1] The reason doubtless lies in the difficulty, well-nigh an impossibility in many cases, of obtaining such information on the Elizabethan ministry. In this respect, however, London may be less unfortunate than other areas, largely on account of the exceptionally high proportion of its incumbents who were products of the universities. It is possible to form some estimate of the class origin of those students whose names appeared in the matriculation registers of the universities; in the case of Oxford the registers are so incomplete for the Elizabethan period as to make the number negligible, but at Cambridge greater notarial efficiency helps to account for two-thirds of the total educated there. As the proportion of Cambridge graduates among the London incumbents almost doubled that of Oxford during the forty-five years of the reign, this is all to the good. No similar means of identification exist for those students whose status on matriculation is unrecorded, nor of the mass of parish clergy - some 45% in 1560, declining to 25% by 1601 - who did not enjoy a university education. In a few cases, precise information can be drawn from the surviving records of the public schools of the city, the registers of Christ's Hospital, or, occasionally, from City Company entries, while some indication of class origin among those ordained in the early years of the reign when men of "base occupation" were

---

1. In a review in The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, viii, No.1. (April 1957), 112.

allowed to fill vacant livings, is also ascertainable. Knowledg of a man's place of birth may also provide a clue, if no more, to his social background.

(i) UNIVERSITY MEN

At Oxford there was at matriculation a graduated scale of fees according to the father's quality, a pleb. fil. being charged less than a gen. fil., a gen. fil. less than an arm. fil. and an arm. fil. less than a mil. fil.[1] Sharp practice in the form of under-valuing one's social status in order to pay reduced fees was a possibility that detracts from the absolute authority of these gradings, and, as Clark advises, where they conflict with evidence from other sources, "the evidence on both sides requires to be carefully weighed before a judgement is pronounced".[2] More serious is the incomplete character of matriculation entries. The records commence in 1567, but not until 1572 was anything approaching a systematic list compiled. If six or seven years are taken as a minimum period for a student to progress from his matriculation to his graduation, ordination, and institution in a City living,[3] information is

---

1. Register of the University of Oxford, ed. A.Clark (Oxford 1887), ii. Pt.i,xxv.
2. Ibid. xxv.
3. The 'new statutes' of the beginning of Elizabeth's reign fixed the period of residence at four years from matriculation for B.A., and three years from B.A. to M.A. (For exceptions and dispensations ibid. 13-21) A student could, of course, enter into orders at any stage of his academic career, so long as he had reached the canonical age, but in practice cases of a man obtaining a London living under the age of twenty-five are extremely rare.

not available for Oxford graduates beneficed before about 1580. Nor does this exhaust the limitations of the registers; students either through their own evasive measures, or on account of their premature age on their first entry into the university, often found themselves unrecorded in the matriculation lists,[1] and as there was no reason to include details of social status in the graduation entries, such particulars of a number of post-1580 incumbents have been lost.

In fact, of a total of about ninety London incumbents between 1559-1603 who are known to have studied at Oxford, details of social origin are available for no more than sixteen; fourteen were entered as pleb. fil.,[2] and the the remaining two as gen. fil.[3] No son of an esquire, let alone a knight, found his vocation in the London ministry, according to the extremely restricted evidence of these figures. While the first of the plebeians came to London in the early 1580s to be presented by the Lord Chancellor to a humbler type of living,[4] the majority

---

1. Ibid. xxiv.
2. The plebs were Edward Vaughan (V. of St.Leonard Shoreditch 1592-6); Morgan Benyon (R. of St.Mary Staining 1581-3, of St. Olave Silver St. 1583-5); Thomas Sanderson (V. of St.Lawrence Jewry 1594-1614); Thomas Colfe (R. of St.Mary Bothaw 1588-99); Peter Fermyn (R. of St.Clement Eastcheap 1595-c.1612); John Randall (R. of St.Andrew Hubbard 1599-1622); Robert Harland (P.C. of St.Mary Aldermanbury 1591-1617); John Heyney (R. of St.Mary Somerset 1585-96, of St.Mary Mounthaw 1589-95, of St.Martin Ongar 1594-1603); John Dove (R. of St.Mary Aldermary 1596-1618); Thomas Sorocold (R. of St.Mildred Poultry 1590-1617); John Vicar (R. of St.Augustine 1600-1633); William Taylor (V. of St. Stephen Coleman St. 1594-97); William Parks (P.C. of Holy Trinity Minories c.1598); Humphrey Aylworth (R. of St.Mary Bothaw 1600-1
3. John Jolliffe (R. of St.Mary Aldermary 1593-6); Ephraim Paget (R. of St.Edmund Lombard St. 1601-c.1642).
4. This was Benyon (Benton).

of them were bunched together in the following decade, and indeed, in 1595 no less than eight benefices were held by seven recent plebeian recruits from Oxford.[1] Six of the fourteen, it is worth noting, were Londoners by birth,[2] and their local connections may have balanced the disabilities with regard to private patrons that men of such origin may have suffered in their quest for preferment.

Despite their London associations, only in two cases has the actual paternal occupation of these plebeian graduates been traced. John Vicars was the son of a citizen and girdler of somewhat obscure distinction;[3] more interesting is the case history of Thomas Colfe. An entry in the admissions register of Christ's Hospital London reads that in 1563 Colfe, 'born at Callis', was 'taken up in the street' at the age of seven, and sent into 'this House' by the Lord Mayor.[4] He was apprenticed to a founder in 1572 for seven years but 'ran awaie' after a short spell. Evidently endowed with an ambitious, no less than an independent mind, he later occupied himself as a 'singing man' until he was given a scholarship by the Salters

---

1. i.e. Vaughan, Sanderson, Colfe, Fermyn, Harland, Heyney (2 benefices), Sorocold, Taylor.
2. Sanderson, Colfe, Fermyn, Vicars, Parks, and Taylor. Fermyn, Taylor and Parks were presented (or donated) to their livings either by parishioners or by private citizens.
3. Alumni Cantab. 1,iv.301.
4. Christ's Hospital Admissions, compiled by E.A.T.Allen (1937), 1,52. cf. Christ's Hospital Exhibitioners to the Universities, ed. A.T.Allan (1924), 19.

Company to study at Oxford. He matriculated at the age of twenty, graduated B.A. in 1582, M.A. in 1584,[1] and four years later was presented by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury to the living of St. Mary Bothaw.[2] In middle age, he retired to the comfortable country living of Burford,[3] remote from the scenes of his foundling childhood. Such an instance of social mobility may not have been exceptional,- several Christ's Hospital wards succeeding in winning scholarships to a university and subsequently entering the church[4] -, but it provides the only concrete example among the London incumbents of the period of the opportunities afforded by the church for men of the humblest origins.

Of the two recorded 'gen. fil', John Jolliffe was a Staffordshire man,[5] and Ephraim Paget was born in Northamptonshire.[6] The latter was the son of a minister, the well-known Puritan Eusebius Paget, himself the son of a Cranford gentleman. It is a reflection on the social consciousness of the time that Ephraim entered himself as a 'gen. fil.' rather than as a 'cler. fil.' although the matriculation fees of the latter were smaller.

---

1. Alumni Oxon, 1,1,305.
2. Henn. 390.
3. Alumni Oxon. 1,1,305. The rectory was assessed at £23 - 0-3d. in the Valor.
4. Admissions, i; 35,39,40,41,42,43,47 et.seq. Another ex-inmate to proceed to a university and return later to London as a minister was Edward Beck, son of a cutler (ibid. 65), but he was not fortunate enough to obtain further preferment than a number of curacies.
5. Alumni Oxon, 1,ii,818.
6. Ibid. 1,iii,1106.

To be the son of a clergyman was evidently in Paget's case not regarded as respectable as a gentleman's pedigree. No generalisations are, of course, deducible from the preponderance of plebeians among the 18% of Oxford students whose class origins can be traced, but it is in character with the ratio of all the entries in the matriculation registers.[1]

The Cambridge lists are more rewarding. Particulars of social origins are available for 104 out of the 160 London incumbents in this period who had been students at the university. Again, the source is provided by the matriculation registers which students on becoming members signed as pensioners, sizars, or fellow-commoners. The first class, Venn[2] tells us, was

> "...that to which the sons of the clergy, the small land-owners and the fairly well-to-do attached themselves. The Sizars were generally poorer students who could not afford the expense of a University course unless they eked out their means by acting as servants to fellows or tutors of their college. The Fellow-Commoners - the smallest class of the three - were invariably the sons of the landed gentry or of the aristocracy; a few entered as nobiles, a term which is self-explanatory."

Bearing in mind the possibility of a student under-valuing his status for purposes of reducing his fee-bills, we can break down the entrants to sixty-one pensioners, forty-two sizars

---

1. cf. Register, ii, 414 for an analysis of the social grades at matriculation, e.g. 1575; 283 fil. pleb.; 105 fil. gen.; 20 fil. armig.; 12 fil. equit.; 3 fil. Baron.
2. Biographical Register of Christ's College 1505-1905, compiled by J. Peile (Cambridge 1910), 1, prefatory note (by J.A.Venn).

(including a sub-sizar), and a solitary fellow-commoner. Three out of every five were thus undergraduates who paid for their own commons and other expenses,[1] and whose background was 'fairly well-to-do'. In a few cases, more precise identification is possible. The sole fellow-commoner was Theophilus, son of John Aylmer, bishop of London and descendant of an ancient Norfolk family.[2] Not all sons of bishops, however considered themselves of such exalted social rank; both the sons of William Downham, bishop of Chester, who entered the London ministry, matriculated as pensioners.[3] As Venn suggests, most clergymen put themselves in this class, as the examples of Edward Wager, perpetual curate of St. Lawrence Pountney in 1592, and the son of a City incumbent,[4] and of John Simpson whose father was a vicar in Essex,[5] bear out. More suggestive of clerical status in London are the histories of Andrew Castleton and Martin Fotherby, both of whom matriculated as sizars,[6] entered the church, obtained City livings, and in time entered their sons at Cambridge as pensioners.

Apart from those with a clerical background, the ex-

---

1. See definition of pensioners, OED.
2. DNB.
3. Alumni Cantab. 1,ii.61.
4. i.e. Lewis Wager, R. of St. James Garlickhythe (ibid. 1.iv. 310)
5. Ibid. 1,iv,79.
6. Ibid. 1,i.306; i,ii,165. On the other hand, Christopher Style, a sizar and later rector of St. Nicholas Acon, entered his son as a sizar (1,iv,181). His status in London, however, did not compare with that of Castleton, nor could his income approach that of Fotherby.

pensioners amongst the London ministry included a number whose fathers were connected with trade in the city. Arthur Bright and Walter Marsh were the sons of mercers, and had both passed to Cambridge from the Merchant Taylors' school.[1] Henry Sledd's father was a fishmonger of sufficient substance to purchase the advowson of a City living '_pro hac vice_'[2] for his son's benefit on his ordination as priest. Others with a commercial background were John Pratt[3] and Lancelot Andrews, the latter the son of a master of Trinity House.[4] For those Cambridge men whose homes were outside London, information is negligible; Nicholas Felton came from a family of Norwich merchants,[5] while John Oliver provides the only record of a yeoman's son - from Paxton in Huntingdonshire, and described as '_tenuis fortunae_'.[6]

Of the forty-odd sizars, obliged by their humble origins to 'work their passage' through college, particulars of paternal occupation are available only in three cases. Samuel Harsnet, rector of St. Margaret New Fish Street at the close of the century, was the son of a Colchester baker;[7] his remarkable rise up the hierarchical ladder culminating in his appointment to the archbishopric of York, epitomises the emancipation of the Elizabethan church from social barriers so long as the

---

1. _Merchant Taylors' School Register 1561-1934_, ed. Mrs.E.P. Hart (1936), _sub_. Bright and Marsh.
2. Henn. 117.
3. His father was a merchant taylor (_Register_, _sub_ Pratt).
4. _DNB_.
5. _Alumni Cantab_. 1,ii,129.
6. _Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College 1349-1897_, compiled by J.Venn (Cambridge 1897),1,93.
7. _DNB_.

aspirant was able to secure a patron of the calibre of Bancroft. Andrew Castleton, the blind and moderately Puritan pastor of St. Martin Iremonger Lane, acknowledged patrons of another kind. His father was a merchant taylor who appears to have eked out a livelihood by serving as parish clerk in St. Benet Gracechurch.[1] After his death, probably of the plague, in 1563, the son was granted a pension of 6d. a week by Christ's Hospital, an allowance that was renewed on his preferment to the university.[2] Further annual contributions came from the parishioners of St. Benet,[3] and he was able to proceed to a higher degree before his ordination and his immediate presentation to his London living by the Lord Chancellor (on the nomination of the bishop of London).[4] In sharp contrast to this illustration of a ministerial career being made possible by the generosity of fellow-citizens, was the case of George Boleyn, rector of St. Dionis Backchurch, and 'not improbably' the son of Viscount Rochford.[5] That a man of such gentle birth could be entered as a sizar at the university can apparently be explained by the persecution and spoliation of property suffered by the family at the hands of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Despite his

---

1. GLMS. 1568, p.14. At one time he occupied a shed in the churchyard (p.33). His funeral expenses were covered by the parish (p.169).
2. Exhibitioners, 15.
3. GLMS. 1568, p.218.
4. Lansd. MS 443, f.239v.
5. For the arguments see DNB.

unfortunate background and the enmities he caused by reason of his somewhat turbulent nature, Boleyn achieved sufficient prominence to be appointed dean of Lichfield cathedral, and to be satirised by Martin Marprelate.

The availability of information concerning the social background of two-thirds of the London clergy who had been educated at Cambridge, allows a closer examination of any possible trend that may have occurred as to the rise or decline of their social status during these forty-five years. If 1580 is taken as a convenient dividing line, of thirty-five ex-Cambridge students whose names appeared in the matriculation lists, and who obtained their first London benefice either before or in 1580, twenty-two were entered as pensioners, thirteen as sizars. Between 1581-1603, when the numbers were almost doubled, partly because the matriculation lists are more complete, and partly because there were far more university-educated incumbents in London in the second half of the reign, the respective figures were forty and twenty-eight. As can be seen, the rate of the proportionate increase of pensioners post-1580 was so infinitesimal as to be negligible.

In a few cases the lacunae in the matriculation lists of both universities are compensated by miscellaneous information from extra-collegiate sources. By reason of his adjustability to the religious changes of the mid-century, it is just possible to include the third son of the Earl of Northumberland, Alan Percy, who died in 1560 after holding the rectory of St. Mary at

Hill for almost forty years,[1] as an Elizabethan incumbent. He, and George Boleyn, probably the son of Viscount Rochford, alone contradicted Latimer's mid-century lament that 'greate mens sonnes' were reluctant to enter the ministry. Infiltration from the ranks of the country gentry, was less rare; Arthur Williams, a Cambridge graduate preferred by Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, to the rectory of St. Andrew Wardrobe, was a member of the Cochwilian family in Caernarvonshire,[2] while Meredith Hanmer, the much-abused vicar of St. Mary Islington, came from like stock in Pentrepant, Flintshire.[3] Richard Bancroft, son of a Lancashire gentleman, and nephew to a bishop, was doubtless placed in the same class,[4] as was Thomas Gattacre, a member of the Shropshire family of Gattacre Hall.[5] Henry Caesar, for a short time the rector of St. Christopher le Stocks, was a brother to Sir Julius, and son of a highly successful physician of Italian extraction.[6]

Stray examples of London graduate clergymen of less exalted birth also survive. In two instances, men who held menial occupations in the royal household sent sons to a university and subsequently to the church. Richard Mountain, father of Thomas, the restored rector of St. Faith in 1559, was a servant

---

1. Henn. 305.
2. Alumni Cantab. 1,iv,414.
3. Y Bywgraffiadur Cymreigh Hyd 1940 (1953), 315.
4. DNB.
5. Alumni Cantab. 1,iii,193.
6. DNB.

to Henry VIII and Edward VI,[1] while John King who succeeded Bancroft in the living of St. Andrew Holborn and later followed him as the bishop of London, was the son of a page to Henry VIII.[2] In his case, some episcopal blood ran in the family, as his great uncle was the first bishop of Oxford. Among those whose homes were in London, three further examples of merchant taylors' sons have been traced;[3] three others were occupied respectively as a mercer, clothworker and turner,[4] while Edward Bragden may possibly have enjoyed the distinction, unique among the incumbents of that period, of appearing in the heraldic visitation of London in 1568.[5]

Altogether, some indication of their social origins is available for about 130 of the 249 incumbents in London between 1559-1603 who had received a university education. The matriculation registers provide for 119 of this total, a source that must be treated with circumspection, but which has been proved generally accurate in those few instances where the particulars can be checked. While the Oxford details are too

---

1. Alumni Cantab. 1,iii,223.
2. Alumni Oxon. 1,ii,852.
3. Henry Withers and George Dickens (A Register of the Scholars admitted into Merchant Taylors' School, compiled by C.J.Robinson (Lewes 1882),i,7); Anthony Silliard, son of William (Register St. Benet Finck, GLMS 4097, f.101r.).
4. Fathers of John Young (Alumni Cantab. 1,iv,493); John Fawcet, (Alumni Oxon. 1,ii,487); John Childersey (Alumni Cantab. 1,i,333).
5. Visitation of London 1568, ed. J.J.Howard and G.J.Armytage, Harleian Soc.,i (1869), 48. Bragden was entered as a pensioner at the university (Alumni Cantab. 1,i,203).

negligible to allow for generalisation, the ratio at Cambridge of five pensioners to every three sizars certainly reflects on Macaulay's claim that "...for one [clergyman] who made the figure of a gentleman, ten were mere menial servants."[1] The illustrations provided demonstrate that by no means all the country gentry had turned their backs on the church as a career, and that London citizens persuaded perhaps by their own piety as well as by the rewards that a London ministry could offer, often encouraged their sons to pass from university to priesthood. The handful of sons of clergy that have been traced indicate a new source of clerical manpower ~~for the church~~ that, judging from the matriculation entries, was seldom plebeian in origins.[2]

(ii) NON-UNIVERSITY MEN

The 185 incumbents unrecorded in any of the university lists represent some 40% of the total number in London livings between 1559-1603. A more accurate cross-section is afforded by the proportion at a particular date; in 1560 it amounted to 45%, declining gradually to 37% by 1583, and more rapidly to 25% by 1601. As the proportion of university recruits rose during the reign,[3] so did the social quality of the London clergy as a whole;

---

1. History of England, 85.
2. Ten incumbents (9 instituted post-1585) are known to have been sons of clergymen, all but one of whom (Knell) had received a university education: i.e. Janeway, Paget, J.Simpson, Aylmer, J.Downham, G.Downham, Lilley, Harrison, and Wager. James Reniger the father of Thomas, R. of All Hallows in the Wall, was ordained deacon shortly after his son (GLMS. 9535/1, f.95v.)
3. Infra, p.p. 91 et seq

an improvement of 15% between the beginning and the close of the reign in educational standards implies a parallel elevation of social standards, and represents a major piece of evidence in favour of a rise in the quality of the London clergy during this period. Bereft of more than an occasional specific record of the paternal occupations of the non-university products, this argument may be substantiated to some extent by more general evidence.

Contemporaries agreed on the necessity of ordaining men of inferior educational and social quality in the opening years of the reign when, according to one observer, the shortage of clergy due to the religious changes on the accession was accentuated by the failure of the universities to replenish their numbers.[1] The classic acknowledgement of this necessity and of its adverse consequences, was expressed in Archbishop Parker's letter to Grindal in August 1560,[2] which, while it was intended for distribution among all the bishops of the province, was of particular relevance to conditions in London. Parker admitted that "...occasioned by the great want of ministers, we and you both, for tolerable supply thereof, have heretofore admitted unto the ministry sundry artificers and others, not traded and brought up in learning, and, as it happened in a

---

1. Oxenbridge in a Paul's Cross Sermon 1566 (Bodl. MS Tanner 50,10,f.35r.)
2. Parker's Correspondence, 120-1 (August 15th 1560).

multitude, some that were of base occupation."

Great offence had been caused by such ordinands "...partly by reason of their former profane arts, partly by their light behaviour otherwise and trade of life;" and the archbishop advised Grindal that henceforth he was to allow only

> "...such as having good testimony of their honest conversation, have been traded and exercised in learning, or at least have spent their time with teaching of children, excluding all others which have been brought up and sustained themselves either by occupation or other kinds of life alienated from learning".

His counsel was meritorious but belated as far as London was concerned. Since his first ordination service on December 28th, 1559, Grindal in a series of mass ceremonies, had admitted no less than 128 men into the ministry, 104 of them in three large groups.[1] The pre-ordination examination, traditionally a safeguard against the entry of ill-qualified candidates, had been borne by Archdeacon Mullins alone on all three occasions, and the very weight of numbers could hardly have made it an adequate test. Thirty-one of the total were either graduates or at the least scholars of universities, and may therefore be exempted from this analysis. Of the remainder, a dozen found their way into London livings, all of them being preferred in

---

1. GLMS. 9535/1, ff.82r-92v. The lists have been printed by Strype, Grindal, 53-60 passim. The figures are based on the diaconate ordinations only.

the early 1560s.[1] If we add to this number the fifteen (probably sixteen) non-university ministers who were ordained deacons either by or on behalf of the archbishop between December 1559 and the issue of Parker's letter in the following August, and who were subsequently preferred to livings in the City,[2] the number of those London incumbents who may have been liable to complaints on account of their "former profane arts" and "base occupation" amounted to at least twenty-seven. Not all were beneficed simultaneously, but between 1559-1570 twenty-four livings were held by these newcomers. Their peak period lay in the early 1560s; in 1561, one out of every seven London incumbents came from this class of ordinand.

---

1. John Gough (R. of St.Peter Cornhill 1560); Thomas Reniger (R. of All Hallows London Wall 1562); Wm. Baldwyn (R. of St. Michael Querne 1561); John Philpot (R. of St.Christopher Stocks 1560); Robert Sheriff (P C. of St.Lawrence Pountney 1561); John Dane (V. of St.Leohard Shoreditch 1560); Richard Bosom (P C. of St.Botolph Aldersgate 1560); Richard Wilmot (P C. of St.Benet Finck 1561); Alexander Smelley (R. of St.Mary Somerset 1560); Richard Weston (P C. of St.James Clerkenwell 1561); Wm. Atkinson (R. of St.Antholin 1562); Robert Clay (R. ofSt.Mary Bothaw 1567).
2. The names are entered in Registrum Matthei Parker, ed. W.H. Frere (Oxford 1928),i,338-353. They were Th. Buckmaster (R. of All Hallows London Wall 1564); Simon More (R. of St. Benet Gracechurch 1564); J.Johnson (R. of St.Andrew Undershaft 1565); J.Lithall (R. of St.Chris. Stocks 1564); Gilbert Jennings (V. of St.Dunstan's West 1570); Rob. Rogerson (R. of St.George Botolph Lane 1562); Peter Greenwood (R. of St.John Evangelist 1564);Brian Barton (R. of St.Mary Bothaw 1560); Th. Walbutt (R. of St.Mary Magdalene Milk St. 1560); Rob. Towne (R. of St.Nicholas Cole Abbe 1589); Lewis Harvey (R. of St.Peter Paul's Wharf 1560); Th.Harrol (P C. of All Hallows Less 1577 ibid.); Wm. Scotson (P C. of St. Botolph Aldgate 1560); Rich. Allen (P C. of St.Katherine Cree 1560),* Another may have been Thomas Earl (R. ofSt.Mildred Bread St. 1564). He himself said that he was ordained deacon in 1559, priest in 1561, (CUL. MS. Mm,1,29,f.45r.). The latter can be checked (Reg. Parker,i,389), but no trace of his diaconate ordination has been found in the archbishop's or bishop's lists.
* and Wm Lockar (PC of St Botolph Aldgate 1560)

Occasionally, it is possible to check the authenticity of Parker's allegations from other sources. John Gough, ordained deacon by Grindal in 1559 and presented to the rectory of St. Peter Cornhill by the Lord Mayor in the following year, was, according to Machyn "...the sune of on Gowth boke-printer, the wyche ded in kyng Henre the viiith, the wyche he dwelt in Lumbarstrett."[1] Despite some inconsistencies, this description appears to link him with John Gough, 'printer, stationer, and translator' of Lombard Street, a printer of early reformist works.[2] Machyn's slighting reference, suggests that to be a son of a minor printer was not yet socially acceptable.[3] A more tenuous link may connect another of these incumbents with the publishing trade: if William Baldwyn, rector of St. Michael le Querne (1561-3), can be identified with the author of 'Canticles or Balades of Salomon' (1549), much of his life was also spent in the printing business before he entered the ministry.[4]

---

1. The Diary of Henry Machyn, 1550-1563, ed. J.G.Nichols, Camden Soc. 42 (1847), 269.
2. DNB. There is a discrepancy between the date of death given by Machyn, and that in the DNB.
3. cf. a similar reference to Robert Crowley who was a printer before his ordination. (Machyn, op.cit. 215.)
4. The connection is suggested by the comment made by Baldwyn in the introduction to one of his works, that by 1559 he had been "called to other trades of lyfe", which the DNB took to mean that he had entered the ministry. The London incumbent of that name was ordained in 1559. It is, however, difficult to reconcile his London origin and his lack of a degree, with the DNB. claim that the publisher was a west-country man, and supplicated for a M.A. in 1532, unless Anthony Wood, who was the DNB.'s source, erred in his identification.

A topical reference made in the heat of the 1566 vestiarian controversy gives a more general indication of the social origins of some of these non-university educated incumbents. They were among the most recalcitrant of the City ministers who refused to subscribe to Parker's ultimatum on the wearing of a surplice; indeed, four of the eight incumbents who were ultimately deprived had entered the church in the mass ordinations of 1559-1560.[1] It was therefore a realistic as well as a shrewd blow on the part of the official apologist put up to reply to Robert Crowley's Vindication of the nonconformist attitude, to attack the non-subscribers on the grounds both of their lack of learning and their socially inferior origins.[2] Crowley, in his reply, did not refute these charges, but claimed a distinguished precedent:[3]

> To be called from an occupation to the mynisterie of the church, is no more reproach nowe, to men mete for that function, then it was to Peter, Paull, and the rest of the apostoles. If they were unmete then the Bishopes are to be blamed for admitting them..."

---

1. Sheriff, Lithall, Gough and Philpot.
2. A Briefe examination for the tyme, of a certaine declaration lately put in print in the name and defence of certaine Ministers in London [anon.] (no date), Sig 3, ff.iv.-2r. "They be but a very few in them selves, other than such as have ben eyther unlearnedly brought up, most in prophane occupations, or such as be puffed up in an arrogancie of themselves."
3. An Answere for the Tyme to the Examination put in Print (1566), Sig. Aiiii, f.4v.

Deprivations, the plague of 1563,[1] and age (several were approaching middle-age on entering the church)[2] took heavy toll of these incumbents of somewhat doubtful origins, and no more than seven out of the total of twenty-seven still survived in London livings post-1575.[3] Inferiority of birth, however, was no grounds for removal, and a few of the over-hastily ordained candidates of 1559-60 lingered on till the close of the century, the occasional one responding nobly to episcopal efforts to improve his learning,[4] others in their senility requiring the aid of coadjutors.[5]

The 1559-60 ordinands did not of course include all the non-graduate incumbents in Elizabethan London, but the special circumstances of their admission puts them apart from the others. There remained as many as thirty-one non-university educated incumbents in 1560 concerning whose origins there is practically no information; the numbers for 1583 were similar, but by 1601 they had declined to twenty-three as the proportion of graduate clergy increased. The rich infusion of Londoners by birth among this group[6] may suggest a paternal background of the artisan

---

1. Baldwyn was certainly a casualty (cf. Stow's Memoranda in Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles, ed. J.Gairdner, Camden Soc. (1880), 126). Others may have included Atkinson and Reniger.
2. e.g. Atkinson (42), Dane (53), Rogerson (42), Weston (38).
3. Wilmot, Smelley, Clay, Buckmaster, Johnson, Towne, Harrold.
4. e.g. John Johnson, Thomas Earl.
5. e.g. Robert Towne (LCCRO. Lib. V.G.Stanhope, ii, f.328r.)
6. Londoners included Pitts (R. of All Hallows London Wall 1572-1593); Masheder (R. of St.George Botolph Lane 1580-4); Lisby (R. of St.Margaret Pattens 1568-90); Morrell (ibm.1590-1608); Lightfoot (P C. of All Hallows Staining 1587); Scarlet (P C. of Blackfriars 1583); Haynes (P C. of the Minories 1568), and perhaps Wager (R. of St.Benet Gracechurch 1567-91).

class, citizens without sufficient means to provide a university education even as a Cambridge sizar or an Oxford pleb for their son, nor enough influence to obtain an exhibition from their company, but who might on occasion be of sufficient status within the bounds of the parish to contrive a benefice for a son. This could only be effected in those parishes where the vestry had a voice in the nomination of the incumbent, if not the right of presentation, but it would account for such coincidences as occurred at St. Margaret Patten,[1] where two successive incumbents were non-graduates of nondescript quality with a local connection. A namesake of John Lisby, the London-born nominee of the parishioners in 1568, who was instituted at St. Margaret within a month of his diaconate ordination,[2] was several times auditor to the church wardens accounts of the same parish.[3] Following Lisby's removal in 1590 for persistently neglecting his cure, the parishioners nominated William Morrell, another non-preacher born in the neighbouring parish of St. Benet Gracechurch, and probably the son of Roger Morrell, one time warden of that parish.[4]

There existed in Elizabethan London a limited opportunity

---

1. e.g. LCRO. Rep.16, f.422r.
2. He was made priest three days before his institution (GLMS. 9535/1, f.140r.; Henn. 287).
3. GLMS. 4570/1, p.14 et.seq. (christian name James). He was a warden of the church 1566-7 (p.55).
4. GLMS. 9535/2, f.41r.; MS. 1568,p.179.

for family investment in the form of the purchase of an advowson, generally pro hac vice.[1] Even well-qualified graduate clergymen sometimes found a living only by such means;[2] as competition intensified after 1580, poorer endowed clergy in particular depended on friends or relatives to secure a presentation on their behalf. The fact that Thomas Earl was presented to the rectory of St. Mildred Bread Street in 1564 by a grocer,[3] may have been a clue to his own background, as may also have been the yeomanry status of the patrons of James Taylor and Edmund Hutchinson at St. Andrew Hubbard[4] and St. Martin Vintry[5] respectively. Bearing in mind, however, the possibility of the patron presenting a protégé unconnected either by blood or occupation, and the allegations of simoniacal transactions made against private patrons,[6] too much cannot be made of this source.

Our conclusions must therefore remain as tentative as those concerning the university men. It is clear that the shortage of clergy on the Queen's accession necessitated the

---

1. cf. Chapter VI, sub The Advowson Market.
2. e.g. Henry Sledd; Anthony Silliard (Henn. 117,230).
3. GLMS. 9531/15, f.134v.
4. Ibid. f.147v.
5. Ibid. f.177r.
6. For a passionate protest against this abuse cf. Asinus Onustus The Asse Overladen [Anon],(1589) e.g. p.21 "For let the best Scholars of any University come to the most zealous Politician of them all, that is a Patron, and desire the gift of any benefice, he shall find, that they have learned the Religion of Judas and Thamar...what will you give mee?"

admission of men of socially inferior rank into the London ministry. While the disapproval of the 'wisest of the realm' and the revival of the universities, particularly Cambridge, as a clerical nursery, soon reduced the intake of men of 'base occupation', remnants of the 1559 ordinands survived till the end of the century, and helped to preserve the curiously hybrid character of the City ministry. Not all the non-university incumbents, however, were of menial origin; men without some limited range of social influence would not have found preferment so readily, while the nascent practice of advowsons purchased pro hace vice allowed for the recruitment of a new class of urban ordinand, often from a background of some means but little social prestige. Indeed, the non-university man occasionally sprang from a more substantial family than his graduate colleague who had struggled through a series of sizarships.[1] On the whole, however, an impression of a class duality remains among the beneficed clergy (as among the ranks of their assistant curates). While the tendency of the social classes from the milites upwards to boycott a clerical career for the sake, generally, of the legal profession, had not permeated deeply into the ranks of the country gentry, an increasing number of men were being recruited from the

1. The poverty-stricken background of Thomas Colfe and Andrew Castleton, both of whom obtained university degrees, may be contrasted with the social influence (within a limited circle) of the Morrell and Lisby families, neither of whom received a higher education.

urban commercial and business classes. The piety of the mercer and clothworker helped to compensate for the aloofness of the earl.

CHAPTER TWO

GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND.

Recent research has stressed the mobile character of the Elizabethan population.[1] E.E.Rich, working from muster rolls and lay subsidy rolls, has been convinced that "...our population was not basically static but contained elements, for larger and more important than has hitherto been conceded, which were moving freely and easily from village to village, village to town, and county to county."[2] "It is the acceptance of mobility as commonplace which is fundamental," he concluded; "such acceptance was alike fundamental to the Elizabethan Englishman facing his problems, and to the modern historian appreciating those problems." Professor Rich's researches did not extend to an analysis of the population of London, but Miss Jeffreys Davis some years ago brought out the consequences on its civic development of the remarkable immigration into the city during the second half of the sixteenth century,[3] while biographical confirmation of the incessant influx abounds in

---

1. E.E.Rich, The Population of Elizabethan England, The Economic History Review, 2nd Series, ii, No.3 (1950), 247-265.
2. Ibid. 262.
3. Elizabeth Jeffreys Davis, The Transformation of London, Tudor Studies, ed. R.W.Seton-Watson (1924), 287-314.

a host of contemporary records.[1] The value of an analysis of the geographical background of the London incumbents lies in the extent to which they reflected the migratory instincts of the rest of the population, or the extent to which movement was conditioned by the distribution of ecclesiastical patronage.

London held an attraction, professionally no less than vocationally, for the aspiring clergyman. Chaucer's model parson was he ~~that~~ *who*

> "Sette not his Benefice on hire
> And lette his shepe encumbered in the mire,
> And ran unto London unto Poules
> To seken him a chaunterie for soules."[2]

The valuation of livings was on average higher in the capital than elsewhere.[3] Moreover, opportunities for augmentation of income existed in London on a scale unknown elsewhere. Most remunerative was a parish lectureship, or a cathedral position, or a post in the Chapel Royal, but there was ample opportunity for humbler ways of service. The cure of souls in a

---

1. One invaluable, but neglected source is contained in the deposition books of the London consistory court (LCCRO), where biographical precis of the age, occupation, place of origin, past and present whereabouts of deponents before the court are recorded. Similar details were given in depositions made in the High Court of Admiralty.
2. Prologue to the Canterbury Tales; quoted by H.H.Milman, Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral (1868), 147. H.H.Thompson, The English Clergy And Their Organisation in the Later Middle Ages (Oxford 1947), cites a case of a medieval parson who deserted his parish to seek a lucrative chantry in London (p.101).
3. cf. Chapter VII, sub Value of Livings.

neighbouring parish could be combined with the enjoyment of a living; the running of the parish school was a clerical priority, if not a privilege. The vast apparatus of City institutions offered by-employments with which no town could compare - the visitorship of a prison, chaplaincies or hospitalerships in the hospitals and relief centres; offices in the chapels of the City companies, or at the Guildhall; commemorative sermons at annual guild services. The opportunities for sermons at the funerals of pious citizens alone made a London preferment a worthwhile consideration. These were the direct by-products of a City incumbency. Often more important were the opportunities offered for making contacts with church patrons, the accessibility of the vast patronage departments of the Crown, lord chancellor, archbishop and bishop. The north nave of St. Paul's, notoriously the royal exchange of the clerical market,[1] was within easy distance of the most outlying City parsonage. On a more intimate level was the prospect of cultivating an influental courtier, or a nobleman with a town-house in London, with a view to a presentation, or a chaplaincy with its attendant privileges.

---

1. cf. the charge made in the Second Admonition that clergymen anxious for preferment, "...set up bills at Paul's, or at the Royal Exchange, and in such public places, to see if they can hear of some good masters, to entertain them into service". (Quoted by Whitgift in his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition; The Works of John Whitgift, ed. J. Ayre, Parker Soc., (Cambridge 1853),iii,246).

Such amenities encouraged all types to enter through its gates, the hireling alongside the missionary, the ambitious with the dispossessed; it enriched London pulpits with the accents of a score of counties, and the vernacular of half a dozen nations.[1] But if access to the capital were unrestricted to the suitably-dispensed ordinand, the pathway to a benefice was far less untrammelled. The meanest cleric from the obscurest background might be furnished with a livelihood, however precarious, from the ecclesiastical scrap-heap of the city, but seldom could he penetrate the network of patronage required to enter the beneficed ranks. While a strong undercurrent of popular pressure existed in many parishes in the selection of an incumbent, the majority of presentations, - those controlled by members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy -, were disposed of, at least ostensibly, without reference to the candidate's geographical background or to the preference of the parish vestry. The geographical pattern is therefore less significant in itself, with the exception of the London-born incumbents, than illustrative of the migratory tendencies of the Elizabethan clergyman.

(i) COUNTY OF ORIGIN

Diocesan ordination books, often containing details of the ordinand's age, background and qualifications constitute

---

1. Churches for immigrants from France, Netherlands, Spain, and Italy, already existed or were set up during this period.

priceless contemporary clerical directories, but few have been preserved, and fewer still explored and printed.[1] Among the exceptions, however, are the London records which survive from the time of the introduction of the English ordinal in 1550.[2] Details of their origin are thus available for all those City incumbents ordained by the bishop of London; as canonical requirements obliged non-graduate clergymen to be ordained in their native diocese,[3] information concerning London-born incumbents is more complete than for those born elsewhere. The following figures on the geographical distribution tends therefore to exaggerate the preponderance of Londoners. They are for the sake of simplicity divided into convenient regions.

Details of native counties are known of 190 incumbents;[4]

---

1. W.H.Frere made an exhaustive search of diocesan registers for Edwardian and Marian ordinations, and listed his findings, 'meagre and disappointing' as they were, in The Marian Reaction In Its Relation to The English Clergy (1896), 90-98, and appendices XII and XX. No such collation exists for the Elizabethan ordinations. Parker's ordinations have been printed (Registrum ed.W.H.Frere (Cambridge 1928), i, passim), as have those of Bishop Cooper of Lincoln (Lincoln Episcopal Records, ed. C.W.Foster, Lincoln Rec. Soc. ii (Lincoln 1912), 81-98).
2. GLMS. 9535/1-2. Frere has printed the 1550 - 8 lists (op.cit 181-210, 252-73 passim), and Strype extracted those ordained by Grindal between 1559-1561. (Grindal, 53-74 passim).
3. A substantial period of residence in that diocese also qualified him for ordination. Letters dimissory from his bishop dispensed a man for ordination in another than his native diocese. (Burn,iii,35-7).
4. In five additional cases the native diocese but no more detailed particulars are known; they were Coventry and Lichfield (2), Norwich (1), Lincoln (1), and Peterborough (1).

1. Diocese of London:[1]	71	
i.e. City	55	
Essex	10	
Middlesex	4	
Herts	2	
2. South-East Region:	17	
Kent	7	
Bucks.	4	
Surrey	4	
Oxford	2	
3. East Anglia:	23	
Lincoln	11	
Norfolk	8	
Suffolk	4	
4. West Midlands:	8	
Shropshire	3	
Warwick	2	
Staffs.	2	
Worcs.	1	
5. East Midlands:	16	
Northants.	6	
Ely	1	
Notts.	2	
Bedford	1	
Hunts.	1	
Rutland	1	
Cambridge	2	
Derbyshire	1	
Leicester	1	

1. Another Londoner may have been William Wager. On his ordination he was said to have been born in the City (GLMS. 9535/1 f.126v.), but giving evidence seven years later in the consistory court, he described himself as a native of Ford in Kent. (LCCRO. Lib. Examin 1574-6, f.16v.). We may charitably attribute the discrepancy to a clerical error rather than to the possibility that he misled the bishop on his ordination to avoid producing dimissories from the ordinary of the diocese of Canterbury.

6.	South-Western Area:	12			
	Hampshire	5			
	Gloucester	5			
	Somerset	1			
	Devon	1			
7.	North-West:	14	8.	North-East:	13
	Lancs.	5		Yorkshire	11
	Cheshire	7		Durham	2
	Westmorland	1			
	Cumberland	1			
		1			2
9.	Scotland	4	10.	Wales	4
				Caernarvonshire	3
				Merioneth	1

---

1. The doubts about James Calfhill's birthplace (DNB.) can be resolved. He was a native of Edinburgh, (not of Shropshire), as is clear from his ordination data (GLMS. 9535/1, f.84r.). Doubts about his origin presumably explains why he was omitted from Gordon Donaldson's list of Scotsmen in English benefices during this period (G.Donaldson, The Relations Between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604, (unpublished Ph.D. thesis London 1938), 278-286.
2. John Heyney, incumbent of three City livings between 1585-1603, may have been a fifth Welshman. The Oxford university register described him as a native of Montgomeryshire (Alumni, 1,ii,702), but according to the details of his ordination, he was born in Bishop Castle, Salop, a few miles from the Welsh border (GLMS. 9535/2, f.25r.). Owen Jones, a native of Machynlleth in Montgomeryshire, was presented but not instituted to St. George Botolph Lane (Lansd.MS.444, f.72l.).

11.	France	5	13.	Miscellaneous	
				Berwick on Tweed 1	
12.	Holland	1			1
				'Haslingburgensis'1	

The London figures come nearest to completeness, and should perhaps be considered in relation to the total number of City incumbents. Even so, a total of fifty-five City-born incumbents during the period constituted a formidable bloc of local ecclesiastical interests, and presented a modifying influence on the cosmopolitan gravitation to the capital. A concept of community loyalty was implicit in the encouragement given by vestry boards for the further education of the more promising young men of the parish, the subsidising of the expenses of a university career, in anticipation of the ordinand's return to serve in a City church, even, perhaps, in his native one. Local-mindedness was most evident in those livings whose advowsons were most susceptible to the preference of citizens, either as a corporate body, or as parochial units, or as private individuals. At St. Margaret Pattens, a rectory in the gift of the Lord Mayor, who, however, generally accepted the nomination of the parishioners,[2] the three Elizabethan incumbents of whom we have particulars[3] were all Londoners, one of them probably

---

1. Thus given by Venn (Alumni Cantab. 1,1,124).
2. e.g. LCRO.Rep. 16,f.422r. The Court of Alderman ordered that the inhabitants of St.Margaret Pattens should present to the court the "...person whom they have gotten to assente to be the parson of theyre sayd churche yf he may have yt." Their nominee was Lisby who was instituted a few weeks later (Henn.286
3. Nicholas Standen, John Lisby and William Morrell (details from their ordination records.)

being a native of the parish.[1] Three successive incumbents of St. Martin Outwich, the advowson of which belonged to the company of Merchant Taylors, were Londoners,[2] two of them being products of the company's school.[3] Both the ministers presented to the vicarage of St. Stephen Coleman Street following the purchase of the advowson by the parishioners,[4] were local men, as were the only two incumbents of St. Lawrence Pountney of whom we have particulars.[5] This underlying element of localism in the most cosmopolitan of cities, while not of course an invariable characteristic,[6] was sufficiently apparent to account for the preference given to seemingly inferior-qualified clerics in some parishes even at the close of the century.[7]

As for those incumbents who came from outside London, figures bring out their widely dispersed geographical background rather than a heavy concentration in certain areas. If the natives of the home counties that lay within the diocese of London are included, the most prolific nursery ground for the

---

1. i.e. Lysby. A James Lysby was warden of the parish in 1566. (GLMS.4570/2,p.55.).
2. Henry Withers, Arthur Bright and William Taylor.
3. Withers and Bright.
4. William Taylor and John Dodd.
5. i.e. after the parishioners purchased a lease of the impropriation in 1588. The men were Richard Lightfoot and Edward Wager.
6. e.g. at the Minories where the donation lay with the parishioners, only two out of the five incumbents whose origins are known, were local products (Walter Haynes and William Parks).
7. See Chapter III, pp. 100-1

City ministry was, as might be expected, the south-eastern region, an area whose proximity and easy accessibility to the capital provided opportunity for making quick contact with City patrons. Much of this region fell within thirty miles distance of London and so enabled a native of Essex or Kent to combine his country living with an incumbency in the city.[1] No doubt the Kentish men from the Canterbury area benefited from the patronage rights in London exercised by the archbishop and the chapter of that cathedral.[2] Others found a cure in their native area a convenient stepping stone to preferment in the City.[3]

A man from a county that lay outside the orbit of the London patrons - and, if we exclude the archbisop's livings, no more than a handful of benefices was controlled by patrons

---

1. A licensed pluralist post-1571 was allowed to hold livings within twenty-six miles distance of one another. One example was the Essex-born Samuel Harsnet who was instituted to the vicarage of Chigwell in 1598 (13⅛ miles from London) and shortly afterwards was collated to the rectory of St. Margaret New Fish Street. Another was William Harrison, who, though City born, owed his preferment to his Essex patron, Lord Cobham. He kept his living at Radwinter as an anchorage from 1559-1593, and periodically added others in the area, including two City rectories. The limit was raised to 30 miles in 1585
2. Peter Lilley, son of a canon at Canterbury, may have owed his London preferment to this connection. His patron was Bancroft, himself a protégé of Archbishop Whitgift (GLMS. 9535/2, f.44r.).
3. Richard Caser, Essex born, was for a decade vicar of Elmstead in the same county before he secured the presentation to All Hallows Honey Lane from the Grocers Company. (GLMS. 9535/1, f.115r; Henn.77) cf. Andrew Janeway, native of Manwedon, Essex (P C. of Titley, Essex 1589) obtained presentation from the Lord Chancellor to All Hallows London Wall 1593 (GLMS. 9535/2, f.48r; Henn.83).

whose interests were independent of the capital[1] -, found the clerical ladder less accessible. The further away he was from London, the less a man depended on his local associations for preferment, and the greater his reliance on his university as his original sponsor. The likelihood of a non-graduate from an area that lay outside the orbit of the London patrons successfully establishing himself in a City benefice was not considerable. The strength of the East Anglian and Midland representation can be explained almost exclusively in terms of a university education; Cambridge, which drew its students largely from the neighbouring counties and the Eastern coastal areas,[2] constituted the major university training ground for the London ministry.[3] Of the thirty-eight natives of those counties included under the general description of East Midlands and East Anglia, only nine by-passed a university on their southward

---

1. Seven were controlled by peers or knights, four by collegiate institutions and two by provincial bishops; otherwise the patronage was focused on groups that dwelt in the capital.
2. "As between the Universities local proximity was the main determining element, the Eastern Counties gravitating to Cambridge and the Southern and Western to Oxford; whilst the Northern were divided between the two, with a decided preponderance towards Cambridge. The difficulties of travel in early times are abundantly sufficient to account for this...the son was naturally sent where the father had been before, and when endowments were founded they were commonly established in the University known to the founder, and were often confined to the district with which he was connected." (Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, compiled by J.Venn (Cambridge 1897), 1,xiii).
3. See Chapter III, pp.92-3

journey,[1] and it is significant that all but two of these established themselves in London livings either before or in the opening years of the reign when the shortage of clergy was at its acutest.[2] One exception, Thomas Cobhed, may justly be claimed to prove the rule; born in Oakham, Rutland, he moved as a youth to the Wessex country, where, after a tardy ordination,[3] he laboured in a small Wiltshire vicarage for some years until he determined to move to the capital "...in hope to have doen better among his frends in London diocese."[4] Lacking educational qualifications, the seal of a college testimonial, or the connections of a local-born product, Cobhed's optimism was not borne out, and he died with no more reward in the form of a living than the temporary tenure of a trifling donative in the Minories.[5]

---

1. Only four out of the thirty were Oxford men - Ephraim Paget, Nicholas Balgay, Richard Ball and Richard Turnbull - a commentary on the accuracy of Venn's description of geographical distribution.
2. They were Thomas Chambers of Hildersham, Camb. (R. of Holy Trinity Less 1555-?1569); Robert Sheriff of Slyford, Lincs. (R. of St. Alphage 1563-67); John Johnson of Peterborough (R. of St. Andrew Undershaft 1565-1596); Christopher Dixe of St. Albans, Suffolk (R. of St. George Botolph Lane 1560-62); Robert Clay of Lincoln (R. of St. Mary Bothaw 1567-74); William Collingwood of Lincoln (R. of St. Margaret Moses 1555-1569) and Richard Wilmot of Steplemorden Ely (P C. of St. Benet Finck c. 1561-1584).
3. He was about 31 years old on his ordination in 1566, probably by the bishop of Gloucester.
4. All this information is taken from a deposition made by Cobhed before the consistory court in 1575 (LCCRO. Lib. Examin 1574-6, f.f. 190v.-192r.)
5. E.M.Tomlinson, A History of the Minories (1907), 220.

A fair sprinkling of incumbents sprang from the counties of the West Midlands and Wessex, although only one has been traced from the extreme south-west counties of Devon and Cornwall. As elsewhere, they owed their London preferments less to their geographical than to their educational backgrounds. Only six non-university products from this area joined the London beneficed ranks, and five of these took advantage of the dearth of suitable clerics on the accession;[1] the other, despite his popularity as a preacher with influential Puritan-minded citizens, found only limited reward in a donative curacy.[2] In common with the general tendency among West countrymen and West Midlanders,[3] the majority of the educated clerics were trained at Oxford;[4] this may explain why fewer men from this part of the

---

1. Thomas Reniger of Glaucenbury (R. ofAll Hallows London Wall c.1562-4); James Reniger of Basingstoke (curate in charge c.1561 of St. Augustine, later rector); Robert Rogerson of Southampton (R. of St. George Botolph Lane 1562-70); William Neal of Worcester (R. of St. Martin Vinty 1556-74); and James Cooke of Bristol (R. of St. Alphage 1561-64).
2. This was Thomas Pratt of Winchester, for several years a curate to the non-resident rector of St. Peter West Cheap, and holder of the Blackfriars donative in 1589 (GLMS. 9537/7, f.103v.) He was recommended, inter alia, by the Puritan-minded alderman, Richard Martin (GLMS. 9535/2, f.42r.)
3. Clark has analysed and tabulated the county origins of Oxford students from the university matriculation lists; the representational preponderance of Devon, Oxfordshire and London, followed by Gloucester, Somerset and Wilts., is clearly shown. (Register of the University of Oxford, ed. A.Clark (Oxford 1887), ii, Pt.ii, 415-420).
4. An exception was Andrew Tirrint of Southampton, curate of Blackfriars in 1595, who graduated at Cambridge (GLMS. 9535/2, f.69v.).

country eventually secured London preferment.

Twenty-seven London incumbents, among them Miles Coverdale, Bancroft, Thomas Sorocold author of the best-selling Supplication of Saints,[1] and the Downham brothers, were born in the province of York; their trek southwards is a commentary on the fluidity of movement between the two provinces, but their preferment arose from reasons that were independent of their native areas, and was largely the consequence of contacts made during or after their career at a university. Remarkable as it may appear, only two out of the twenty-seven had not passed through a university: one was the Kirby-born John Askew who had spent sixteen years in London, perhaps following a trade, before his ordination in 1567,[2] and as such enjoyed the privileges of a local man. The other, John Taylor of Northwich, Cheshire, evidently took advantage of a vacancy in the rectory of St. Mary Staining to be ordained almost simultaneously to the diaconate and priesthood,[3] and to be presented forthwith to the living by the Lord Chancellor on Grindal's recommendation.[4] Apart from these two exceptions, the stepping stone from a York or Lancashire home to a London benefice lay at Oxford or Cambridge.

---

1. First published in 1608, it reached forty-five editions by 1754.
2. GLMS. 9535/1, f.132r.
3. Ibid, f.129v.
4. Lansd.MS. 443, f.157v.

The infusion of non-English blood into the London ministry, amounting to fourteen, or fifteen incumbents if George Gardiner, a native of Berwick-on-Tweed, claimed independent status, was a concession on the part of City patrons to the cosmopolitan character of the population. A 'strangers' colony which in 1573 totalled 4287, of whom 3160 were Dutch, 440 French and 423 Burgundians, could not be a negligible force in London ecclesiastical politics,[1] and the parochial records testify to the infiltration of foreigners into local affairs.[2] The preferment of Adrian Redlegge, almost certainly identifiable with the Dutch minister who "...came into this realm about XX yeares past for the worde of God,"[3] to the vicarage of St. Bartholomew Hospital may well have resulted from the pressure of the Dutch faction in that area on the patrons, the governors of the hospital.[4] Two of the incumbents born in France, were veteran reformers who had fled to London in Henry VIII's reign, and had by 1560 attained positions of considerable prestige in

---

1. Rich. loc. cit. 263.
2. The 1571 returns of aliens in London specified, inter alia, the church they attended; an enormous number are recorded as being members of London parish churches rather than their own 'strangers' church. (Return of Aliens...in London, ed. R.E.G. and E.F.Kirk, Huguenot Society of London, X (Aberdeen 1902),ii, 19154 passim).
3. Ibid. 10. His parish church was described as the 'Hospitall' i.e. St. Bartholomew's Hospital.
4. There were 248 'strangers' dwelling in the ward of Farringdon Without in 1571, of whom 76 attended a local parish church. 158 of the 248 total were of Dutch origins (ibid.10).

the city.[1] The other three were natives of Calais, two being born at a time when that town was still in English occupation.[2] Another incumbent, Robert Heax, the 'faithful pastor' of St. Botolph Aldgate, was the son of a French [redacted] refugee.[3]

A large number of Scottish ministers found their way to London during this period, several of them in the mid-1580s following the episcopal reaction in Scotland.[4] Only four Scots, however, obtained preferment in the city; one of these had been resident in England since 1540, and was rector of St. Matthew Friday Street from 1559 until his death in 1573.[5] Two others, John Morrison[6] and David English,[7] were confined to donatives, and the only Scotsman to benefit substantially from his London ministry was James Calfhill, a native of Edinburgh, who gained the patronage of Grindal, and was successively archdeacon of Colchester and bishop-elect of Worcester before

---

1. John Veron (of Sens), and Peter Alexander (of Arras). Veron in particular was a notable City preacher (The Diary of Henry Machyn, ed. J.G.Nichols, Camden Soc. (1848), 228-301 passim.).
2. John Thorpe, born 1550 (Alumni Cantab. 1,iv,236) and John Copcott who matriculated at Cambridge in 1562 (Alumni, 1,i,393). The other, Thomas Colfe, was born in 1559 (Alumni Oxon,1,i,305).
3. Returns of Aliens, i,390.
4. Donaldson, op.cit. 278-286 passim.
5. Return of Aliens, ii,11.
6. P C. of St. Botolph Aldersgate 1582-92 (listed by Newcourt, i,916, but overlooked by Henn.)
7. P C. of Minories, of St. Katherine Cree 1595 (Lib.V.G. Stanhope, ii,f.4r., Pt.iii, f.56v.) of Blackfriars 1592 (GLMS. 9537/8, f.77r.) English was born in Ardet (GLMS. 9535/2, f. 49v.)

his promising career was cut short at the age of forty-one.[1] Despite the moderate reformism of Calfhill, and later, of David English, Scottish influence on the radical wing of the London clergy came less from their beneficed representatives, all but one of whom had entered the ministry under the Anglican ordinal,[2] than from the lecturers and preachers who itinerated about the city.[3]

Nor were the Welsh incumbents a more dominant influence. Most prominent was Henry Holland, editor of Richard Greenham's collected works, and a protégé of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex;[4] the others, all graduates,[5] owed their preferment to their educational qualifications and university connections rather than to the country of their birth. Not until Richard Vaughan, the Caernarvonshire-born holder of three bishoprics in succession, and later on, his compatriot John Williams, achieved episcopal rank, did Welshmen secure an influential clerical patron in London.[6]

---

1. DNB.
2. The exception - celebrated as it became - was Morrison.
3. See Chapter XI.
4. Bywgraffiadur, 339. The DNB's uncertainty about his birthplace is here cleared up.
5. Three were from Cambridge (Arthur Williams, David Roberts, Henry Holland); one from Oxford (Ed. Vaughan).
6. Vaughan became bishop of London in 1604; his two examining chaplains in that year were Owen Gwyn, a Denbighshire man who was later Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, and Ithel Griffith, a non-graduate (GLMS 9535/2, f.134r.) cf. D.Mathew, Wales and England in the Early Seventeenth Century, The Transactions of Hon. Soc. of Cymmrodorion (Session 1955), 36-49.

This account of the geographical background of the City incumbents paradoxically gives an impression both of the magnetism of London to aspiring ordinands from widely scattered areas, and of the community-loyalty of citizens for local-born products. This duality was reconciled by the existing pattern of patronage which was flexible enough to allow room for both natives and 'strangers'. The strength of the local interests did however make it increasingly difficult - once the clerical dearth on the accession had been overcome -, for an ill-qualified 'outsider' to secure a benefice, so that it was generally the university-trained countryman, with a debt to contacts there made, and not to his own locality, that made a success of his London career.

(ii) DIOCESE OF ORDINATION

The particulars of their county origins suggest a widely distributed geographical pattern with a solid nucleus of local products among the London incumbents of the period. Further illumination on their migratory tendencies may be obtained from the details of their ordination. How general was the custom of receiving orders in the native diocese and subsequently coming to London for preferment? How often did rural candidates find it advantageous to seek orders from the bishop of London rather than their own diocesan? In brief, how far did the ordination records of the London ministry reflect the magnetism of the capital for both country and urban-born clerical

aspirants? First, however, must be considered the effect of canonical regulations concerning ordination on the freedom of movement.

Medieval constitutions tended to discourage the migration of potential ordinands from their native dioceses, laying down that candidates should be admitted by their own bishop, unless they were granted letters dimissory to seek orders elsewhere.[1] The exception to this rule, which allowed students resident at a university to be admitted into the ministry by any bishop without the need for covering letters,[2] was consistent with the underlying assumption behind the constitution, that the local bishop was most likely to know the qualities of a candidate; such a precaution would not be necessary with a university-trained ordinand. By the Elizabethan period, the application of the rule was also flexible enough to allow for the ordination of men in a non-indigenous diocese in which they had spent a period of residence without requiring dimissories.[3]

---

1. Burn, iii,35. Dimissories could be granted by bishop or vicar-general, but not by archbishop (except during a metropolitan visitation), archdeacon or his official. For another view of archiepiscopal power see Irene J. Churchill, Canterbury Administration, (1933),i,104.
2. The origins of this exception is not known. According to Edmund Gibson (Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani (Oxford 1761), i,142, note r.), Fellows of certain colleges were granted this privilege in "ancient Acts of Ordination", but it was by no means a general right in both universities. A 1575 constitution allowed the dispensation to all graduates resident in either university, and this was expanded to include all students by the canons of 1597 and 1604 (No.34) (Card.Synod. i,133,148,267).
3. Burn,iii,37.

In practice, those ordinands, who wished to transfer to another diocese and could not qualify for either of the above exceptions, do not appear to have had much difficulty in obtaining letters dimissory, either to the diaconate, priesthood, or both.[1] Dispensations were also possible for obtaining orders without such letters, and irregularity seized upon by contemporary critics.[2] The Elizabethan authorities attempted to control any abuse by insisting that dimissories were given "...under the hand and seal of that bishop, of whose diocese they are, and not...of any chancellor, or other officer to any bishop"[3], an amendment of the medieval constitution made necessary by the post-Reformation secularisation of the administrative hierarchy of a diocese.

It may reasonably be assumed, therefore, that canonical regulations were not a major obstacle to those who sought orders in a diocese other than their own. The London clergy certainly benefited from the exempting clauses concerning letters dimissory. A number, particularly in the early years of the reign, sought orders at a somewhat mature age after following secular occupations for several years; often they were countrymen who had come to London to seek jobs, and were

---

1. This is inferred from the frequency with which dimissories were granted to outsiders entering London for ordination.
2. cf. the 1575 articles against "...forg'd and counterfeit letters of orders." (Card. Synod.i,134).
3. Ibid. i,134 (1575 articles).

by virtue of their length of residence there, admitted into the ministry without letters dimissory from their native diocese.[1] Some of their contemporaries, with less canonical justification, also seem to have avoided dimissories, an irregularity on the part of the bishop of London that was perhaps made unavoidable in the early 1560s by the dearth of available clergy, but which grew less excusable as the supply improved.[2]

A more serious, albeit indirect, influence on inter-diocesan migration for purposes of ordination, were the canonical requirements 'ad titulum', that is, the necessity for the candidate to hold a 'title' to a cure for souls before he could be admitted into the ministry. Intended to prevent a surplus of clergy, and consequent under-employment, the regulation was less relevant to conditions in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign than subsequently. On the face of it, the canon, which obliged potential clerics to look for an

---

1. This dispensatory clause explains the insertion in the ordination records of the number of years such candidates had spent in the city or diocese. The rule appears to have been extremely elastic, any period of residence being accepted. Two examples: John Askew, of Lancashire ordained deacon by Grindal 1567 at the age of 32, having been in London for the last 16 years; rector of St. Mary Magdalene Milk St. 1572. (GLMS. 9535/1, f.132r; Henn.319). Thomas Mathew, born in Suffolk, ordained deacon 1595 aged 50, resident in City for last two years (GLMS. 9535/2, f.68r).

2. This irregularity is inferred from the absence of the entry 'li.di.' (literis dimissis) opposite the records of such persons in the ordinations lists, e.g. Richard Wilmot, a native of Ely diocese, ordained deacon in London 1560 without dimissories or dispensation.

office - generally a curacy, often of a very temporary nature[1] - before seeking orders, acted as a deterrent to migration; for the inexperienced ordinand was most likely to find such office in the area where he was best known, which more often than not would be the locality in which he had been brought up, or had spent a period of residence. But in practice this tendency was partially vitiated by the array of exceptions to the rule. Fellows of colleges were traditionally exempted, as were those known to have a sufficient patrimony of their own, or who were forthwith to be placed by the bishop of the diocese.[2]

Further concessions in the 1604 canons covered college chaplains and masters of arts of five years standing "...that liveth of [their] own Charge in either of the Universities", but cut out the old-established title of patrimony.[3]

It is difficult to establish how far London ecclesiastical practice conformed to the requirements of the canon.[4] In

---

1. A presentation to a living, a cure of souls, and a cathedral or collegiate dignity or office were all legitimate titles. For an account of medieval titles, cf. H.S.Bennett, Medieval Ordination Lists in The English Episcopal Registers, Studies Presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, ed. J.C.Davies (1957), 25-31.
2. Gibson, op.cit., i,140.
3. Ibid.140. The 1604 concessions may, Gibson argues, have found precedent in the general terms of the exceptions laid down in the Articuli Cleri of 1585 and the Constitutions of 1597 (note h).
4. A bishop who overlooked the requirements of a title, was obliged to maintain the ordinand until he received preferment. Refusal made him liable to a year's suspension from giving orders (Burn,iii,30). This in itself was a deterrent to episcopal negligence.

contrast to Bonner's ordination lists in the Marian period, not until 1583 did those of his Elizabethan successors begin to specify the 'title' which qualified candidates for ordination.[1] Many of the earlier ordinands, however, are known to have been immediately constituted to cures,[2] and, indeed, despite the spate of admissions by Grindal, few could have failed to find some form of preferment in the first decade of the reign. The shortage was steadily abated later in the reign, but there appear to have been few failures to obtain titles when they were canonically required.[3]

We can now discuss the ordination data of the London incumbents in the light of the influences above mentioned. Details of either their diaconal or priestly ordination, or both, have been found for 172 of the beneficed clergy, about two-fifths of the total. 114 out of the 172 were ordained by the bishop of London,[4] forty-one deacons, twenty-one priests, and fifty-two both deacon and priest. This overwhelming

---

1. GLMS. 9535/2, f.21r.
2. Thomas Jenkinson, deacon January 14th 1560; R. of St. Mary Woolchurch February 22nd, 1560 (GLMS. 9535/1, f.83r.; Henn 317) John Lysby, deacon November 30th, priest December 27th, instituted to St. Margaret Pattens, December 30th (all in 1568) (GLMS. 9535/1, f.140r. and v.)
3. GLMS. 9535/1-2, passim. More substantial grounds for criticism exist along the lines of Gibson's complaint of titles to temporary cures, with the consequent "...Scandal and Inconveniences of many kinds, which accrue to the Church, by multiplying the numbers of Clergymen so far beyond the number of Benefices." (Op.cit. 141, note k.)
4. Or by a suffragan or another bishop on his behalf.

preponderance of locally-ordained clerics in London livings is exaggerated somewhat by the fact that only the London records have been fully explored, and it would be more accurate to see the figures in ratio to the total number of London incumbents, some 450. Even so, 25% of the London beneficed clergy were indigenous ordinands.[1] If we discount the thirty-two who were born in the City, and the dozen others whose homes were in the same diocese, there remain seventy persons who found it advantageous to be ordained by the bishop of London rather than in their native diocese.

A small number were long-established residents in the capital, with but tenuous associations with their native localities.[2] A much larger percentage were university products[3] who presumably chose London either because they had been promised preferment in that diocese[4] or because they anticipated

---

1. Of a total of 55 City-born incumbents, 23 were therefore made deacon or priest (or both) outside their native diocese of London. They cannot all be traced, but the majority, being products of Cambridge, were ordained in Ely or a contiguous diocese. e.g. William Marsh, Abraham Fleming, Thomas Duffield.
2. e.g. Christopher Dixe resident in City 12 years pre-ordination; John Askew (16 years), (GLMS. 9535/1, ff.9r.,132r).
3. 52 of the 68 were educated in a university.
4. e.g. John Jackson, a Cambridge graduate ordained d. and p. by Aylmer in 1591 (GLMS. 9535/2, f.54v.). He was for a time curate to Lancelot Andrews at St. Giles Cripplegate until the latter secured his nomnation to St. Alban Wood St. in 1595. (GLMS. 7673/1, f.119v.). John Taylor of Cheshire, was admitted into both orders in London a few weeks before he was preferred to St. Mary Staining on Grindal's nomination (GLMS. 9535/1, f. 129v., f.130r.; Lansd. MS. 443, f.157v.)

some reward out of the vast patronage resources focused there.[1] The abundance of curacies made it easier to obtain the necessary 'title' in the capital than elsewhere.[2] On several occasions, candidates were admitted deacon and priest by the bishop within a period shorter than that stipulated by canon law,[3] - not infrequently they were dispensed by the archbishop to enter both orders simultaneously -, in order to be preferred at once to a vacant living.[4] Others, perforce content with a curacy for a time, sometimes delayed taking priest's orders until they

---

1. e.g. James Calfhill made enough impression on Grindal to be appointed his chaplain and collated to the rectory of St. Andrew Wardrobe in 1562 (Henn.88). Simon Buttery, a Northamptonshire-born schoolmaster in Aylmer's household, was collated to St. Anne and Agnes on his ordination. (GLMS. 9535/1, f.159v.).
2. If we are right in thinking that the 'title' requirements were generally enforced, - as is certainly suggested by the London ordination records -, this was obviously an important consideration in the later part of the reign when improved supply intensified competition for clerical positions, cf. Chapter IX for account of the temporary nature of many of these titles.
3. The rule of the medieval canon law was five years. The rubric in the 1552 Prayer Book brought it down to a year "... except for reasonable causes it shall otherwise seem good unto the Bishop," a concession confirmed and extended in the 1604 canons (Gibson, op.cit. 1,151.). In practice a year's interval between diaconate and priestly ordinations was rare in London, unless the ordinand was not anxious to enter higher orders in a shorter time. The intervals between the ordinations performed in 1559-60 were particularly brief, because of the clerical shortage, e.g. 26 persons ordained deacons on January 14th,1560 were admitted priests on the 24th of the same month (GLMS.9535/1 f.83r.-85r.).
4. E.g. Gervase Smith, rector of St. Martin Ludgate in 1567, was admitted simultaneously to diaconate and priesthood in 1564 in order to take up a living in Essex (GLMS. 9535/1, f.115r.). Dispensations could only be issued by the archbishop.

obtained a presentation.[1] The fact that this might be in another diocese partly accounts for the number who were only admitted deacons by the bishop of London and moved elsewhere to receive priest's orders, returning later to a City benefice.[2] Conversely, at least twenty-one incumbents during the reign were ordained deacons elsewhere than London, and came to the capital to seek priestly orders usually when they had secured a presentation to a living in that diocese.[3] The numerous cases we have of bi-diocesan ordinations of this nature reflect the mobile instincts of the Elizabethan clerk, little affected by the mildly restrictive intentions of canonical regulations, as he casually attached himself to a likely patron.

As might be expected, the majority of City incumbents not ordained locally were admitted in those dioceses that neighboured on the university at Cambridge; Ely, Peterborough

---

1. e.g. Andrew Janeway, deacon 1589, priest 1593 on his presentation to All Hallows in the Wall, (GLMS. 9535/2, ff.48r., 63v.). Canon law barred all but priests from holding benefices or donatives (Burn, iii,46), but a few irregularities have been traced in London e.g. Silliard, a deacon on his presentation to the vicarage of St. Mary Islington, was not made a priest until sixteen years later (GLMS. 9535/2, f.17v.).
2. e.g. David Roberts was ordained deacon in London 1580 and priest in Ely in the same year. Shortly afterwards he was presented to the vicarage of Holy Trinity, Cambridge (Alumni Cantab. 1,iii,464). A decade later he returned to a London living (Henn.88).
3. John Young, chaplain to Grindal, who was ordained deacon in Ely, was actually in possession of his London benefice of St. Martin Ludgate before he was made priest (GLMS. 9535/1, f.120v.). Robert Charke was ordained priest by Aylmer five days after his institution to St. Alban Wood St. (GLMS. 9535/2, f.iv.).

and Lincoln between them produced twenty-one full ordinands for the London ministry.[1] These were invariably university products who found it convenient to be ordained locally before journeying southwards, or, in some cases, in order to pursue further theological courses.[2] No equivalent nucleus of men ordained in the diocese of Oxford has been traced, the see being vacant for a considerable part of the Elizabethan period;[3] consequently a greater proportion of the Oxford than the Cambridge graduates among the London incumbents whose ordination records are known, t ended to come to the capital to seek admission into the ministry.[4]

Of the remainder, a group had been ordained either by the archbishop, or a bishop in his name, the majority of them in

---

1. Richard Wood, Richard Bancroft, Henry How, John Dix, William Sage, Francis Dalton, Barnard Jenks, George Best, Ambrose Golding, Thomas Kendall (?), William Ashbold, Christopher Webber, Ambrose Fleming, Francis Byard, Lawrence Barker, Thomas Mann, Edward Wager, William Hubbock, Robert Openshaw, Thomas Coren and Thomas Duffield.
2. Some, of course, obtained livings in these or other dioceses, moving to London later in their career, e.g. Bancroft, ordained by Cox, bishop of Ely, was collated to the rectory of Teversham near Cambridge, in 1576, eight years before he came to London. (Alumni Cantab, 1,1,78).
3. The only Oxford ordinand traced has been John Hemming, admitted deacon and priest by Bishop Curwen in 1568 on the title of Merton College (S.S.Pearce, The Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Oxford...[in] 1559 and Afterwards, Oxford Arch. Soc., 62-68, (1917), 24;206. For the episcopal vacancies see Le Neve, ii, 504-5.
4. e.g. Henry Bedell, Thomas Gattacre, Nicholas Balgay, James Calfhill.

the early years of the reign.[1] Several were admitted deacons at Lambeth and priest by the bishop of London, or vice-versa. The reasons for such short-distance migration, were probably peculiar to each individual, who turned for priestly ordination to the authority which promised him preferment.[2] A few scattered instances of ordination in outlying rural dioceses have been traced,[3] but the most exceptional case, as controversial to contemporaries as to posterity, was that of John Morrison, perpetual curate of St. Botolph Aldersgate 1582-1592. He was a Scotsman admitted into the ministry according to the Presbyterian form of ordination, who was later licensed by the vicar-general of Canterbury province to preach and administer the sacraments in the Anglican church without

---

1. Six were ordained deacons, seven priests, and nine were admitted to both orders by (or on behalf of) the archbishop during Parker's primacy. (Reg. Parker, i,340-353 passim).
2. e.g. James Cooke, ordained deacon at Lambeth, was admitted priest by Grindal prior to his collation by the bishop to the rectory of St. Alphage (Ibid.342; GLMS. 9535/1, f.99v.). This was not invariably the explanation, for John Philpot, admitted priest at Lambeth, March 10th 1560, was shortly afterwards collated by the bishop of London to St. Christopher Stocks (Henn. 282). It is possible that an ordinand's choice of bishop was also determined by the varying standards of the preliminary examinations in different dioceses.
3.

Norwich:	d. and p.	2	Worcester:	d. and p.	1
	d.	1		d.	1
	p.	1	Chester:	d. and p.	1
	No details	1	Lichfield and Coventry:	no details	1
Gloucester:	d. and p.	1			
	No details	1			

[d. = deacon; p. = priest.]

undergoing re-ordination.[1] Rare enough in Elizabethan England, this type of dispensation, which, Professor Sykes remarks, would have been anathema to Laud, became a live issue at the end of the seventeenth century, and Grindal's action was viewed with much regret by the hierarchy of the day.[2]

We may conclude that the surviving ordination records suggest even more strongly than the particulars of their geographical origin, the attraction of London to the potential cleric. To those whose movements were not restricted by canonical regulations, ordination by the bishop of London implied a deliberate choice on their part. An immediate practical consideration was the availability in the capital of so many curacies that qualified as a requisite 'title'; a longer-term consideration was the prospect, particularly among men who had no influential private patrons, of attracting the favour of the bishop, or impressing his examining chaplains in the pre-ordination test, and thus benefiting from the patronage resources at the episcopal command.

(iii) AGE AND EXPERIENCE

The problems confronting the ministry of a city with its

---

1. A copy of the faculty was entered in the London Lib. VG. records (Hamond, f.343r.). It is printed in N.Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter (Cambridge 1956), 96, where the issues raised are discussed at length. Of the four Scotsmen holding livings, Morrison alone had not been admitted under the Anglican (or pre-Edwardian) ordinal. He had been ordained by the General Synod of Lothian in Garvet.
2. Ibid. 97-8.

teeming population, its under-privileged classes, its periodic plague outbreaks, and its many distractions from religious worship, called for pastoral qualities of a high order. A learned ministry, well-versed in scriptural casuistry, could appeal to the biblical knowledge of citizens;[1] an industrious ministry, resident and hospitable, could endure the propaganda of Puritan critics of clerical standards. Above all, a mature ministry, rich with the experience of pastoral care, and in the art of personal relations, was needed to provide a firm foundation to the Anglican establishment in a city notorious for the whimsicality of its religious allegiance.[2] Where no more intimate evidence survives, we must rely on biographical statistical information, sometimes unavoidably misleading, and never comprehensive. Nevertheless, the particulars of the ages of the City incumbents at specified dates, and on the length of their service previous to their London preferment, are of value in that they provide the only clue to the breadth of

---

1. cf. L.B.Wright, Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England, (1935), 241: "Thanks to countless manuals, the private citizen had become articulate in the presence of the Diety". A contemporary, commenting on the popularity of devotional works, described a "...booksellers shoppe on Bartholomew day at London: the stalls of which are so adorned with bibles and prayer-books, that almost nothing is left within, but heathen knowledge." (ibid.235).
2. c.f. Whitgift's admonition to "...some of the citizens... that they abuse not the gospel to serve their affections, that they make it not a cloke for their contentions, that they wax not weary of it, and desire strange doctrines, that they heap not up such preachers unto themselves as may serve their humours...". (The Defence of the Answer to the Admonition in Works of Whitgift, iii,5.).

their experience.

Canon law laid down a minimum age for entry into the ministry, allowing no-one to be ordained deacon under the age of twenty five years unless he received dispensation.[1] Sixteenth-century modifications occured both in the Catholic and Reformed churches; in England the age was reduced to twenty-one in 1549,[2] raised to twenty-three by convocation in 1575,[3] and finally settled at that age in the 1604 canons.[4] The 1549 Prayer Book required an interval of three years before entry to the priesthood at the age of twenty-four, but this was cut down to a year as later regulations raised the minimum age of deacons; the 1571 Act as well as a number of Elizabethan canons standardised the age of admission as priest at twenty-four.[5] Neither in intention nor in practice were these stipulations inflexible, for dispensations were available both for entry into orders under age, and for reducing the obligatory interval between diaconate and priesthood.

In London, the latter was the more common dispensation; deacons who had obtained a presentation to a living found little difficulty in securing a faculty from the archbishop to enter priest's orders either simultaneously or within the required

---

1. Gibson, op.cit.i,145,note ℣.
2. Ibid. 145.
3. Card. Synod, i,133.
4. No. XXIV (ibid. 266).
5. Gibson, op.cit.i,146. cf. articles of 1575, 1585, constitutions of 1597 (Card. Synod.,i,133,140,148.)

interval in order to take up possession of their benefice. Inferior clergy holding assistant curacies or other of the medley of unbeneficed positions in the city, often remained in deacon's orders for longer than the minimum legal period, reluctant to undergo the expense of further ordination until they had prospects of a presentation.[1] Rarely, however, did the beneficed clergy risk serious ecclesiastical censure by holding livings without taking priest's orders;[2] the one outstanding exception, Anthony Silliard, vicar of St. Mary Islington for sixteen years before he was made priest, appears to have evaded episcopal notice by persistent non-residence and non-attendance at visitations.[3]

Dispensation to hold orders while under age was intended to encourage talented young men to enter the ministry, but was generally sought by those fortunate enough to obtain a presentation while still in their canonical minority. Often, of course, the recipients of such favours were also

---

1. The 1604 canons (No.XXXV) laid down 10/- as the maximum fee chargeable for ordination (Burn,iii,42).
2. cf. Gibson, op.cit,i,146,note x; "...till they are admitted to the Order of Priesthood, they are not capable of any Benefice or Ecclesiastical Promotion."
3. Ordained deacon 1566, priest 1581 (GLMS. 9535/1,f.124r., 9535/2,f.17v.). It was not uncommon to find incumbents being ordained priests a few months after their institution, an irregularity caused by the rule confining ordinations to certain dates within the year, e.g. Andfew Castleton was instituted to St. Martin Iremonger on January 16th 1577 and not made priest until the following May (Henn.282; GLMS. 9535/1, f.135v.).

academically well-equipped but they did not always go together. During Grindal's tenure of office in London, (1559-70), the low minimum age for diaconate admission, and the high incidence of men of maturer years who were ordained, particularly in 1559-1560, cut out the possibility of dispensated diaconate admissions of this kind, but occasionally a person was made priest under age. The most spectacular of these entries was the Puritan John Field, at the age of twenty-one.[1] Such an irregularity, while not unprecedented, was rare enough to cause us to speculate how far it was the result of pressure from Field's patron, the Earl of Warwick,[2] or a tribute by the bishop to Field's considerable intellectual gifts.

Bishop Sandys, the infrequency and smallness of whose ordinations offer a striking contrast to the mass ceremonies of his predecessor,[3] adhered rigidly to the stipulations concerning canonical age. His successor, John Aylmer, who took up his position shortly after the minimum age for deacons had been raised from twenty-one to twenty-three, was less scrupulous, some concessions no doubt being made unavoidable by the revised

---

1. GLMS. 9535/1, f.124v. (March 25th 1566). No archiepiscopal dispensation was recorded against his name.
2. SP. i,135; cf. P.Collinson, The Puritan Classical Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth I (Ph.D. London,1957), 372,note 2.
3. During his six years in London, Sandys undertook only three ordinations services, admitting in all twenty-six deacons, and twenty-five priests. Between 1574-77 not one person was admitted to either order. (GLMS. 9535/1,ff.149v-152v.).

constitutions. University students graduating at the age of twenty-one or twenty-two, who had previously been able to commence immediately on their clerical careers, were now obliged to occupy themselves otherwise for a year or two. Useful as it may have been to those who were able to pursue further collegiate courses, or take up temporary posts as parochial schoolmasters,[1] this restriction may have struck hardly at the less fortunate. Aylmer consequently occasionally accepted candidates for the diaconate at the age of twenty-two, apparently without dispensation, so long as they had successfully passed the preliminary examination, and possessed legitimate titles.[2] His motives were not always disinterested, a flagrant breach of the canon occuring when he admitted his son Theophilus a deacon at the age of eighteen in order to give him a prebend in St. Pauls.[3] Theophilus' premature advancement later

---

1. Several future London incumbents obtained teaching licences from the vicar-general of the diocese in the interval between leaving the university and taking orders, e.g. George Dickens: B.A. 1571, M.A. 1576, schoolmaster in Highgate 1576, ordained deacon and priest 1577, chaplain to Aylmer 1578, R. of St. Alban Wood St. 1580. (Alumni Oxon, 1,i,401; GLMS. 9535/1, f.154r. and v.; LCCRO Lib. V.G.Hamond, f.131r.; Henn.72). cf. the dedication in John Walsal's Sermon Preached at Paul's Crosse (1578), "...I was first called from the vniversitie to teach your [Lady Anne Bacon] two sonnes...and I was likewise first called from teaching of children, to instruct men..." (Sig.Av, f.2v.).
2. e.g. GLMS. 9535/2, ff.1r.,4r.,39r.
3. GLMS. 9535/2, f.20v. He was collated to the prebend of Finsbury, valued at £29.13.4 in 1535 (VE.,i,365). He did not receive a cure of souls until he became priest.

brought serious repercussions, first on his priestly ordination,[1] and two years later, on his collation by his father to the archdiaconate of London, when Nowell, the dean of St. Paul's refused to install him on account of his age.[2] Aylmer's episcopal successors were less indiscreet, and only one case of a man being ordained deacon under the age of twenty-three has been traced, occurring during the vacancy in the see following Fletcher's death.[3]

Apart from these minimum requirements, there were no ecclesiastical regulations that affected the age and experience of the London clergy. The variety of patrons and the motives that lay behind their presentation of candidates made unavoidable a ministry miscellaneous in age, character and maturity. Even the bishop of London, with all his influence over the City patrons, was far too deeply involved in the subtleties of the patronage system to maintain a consistent, co-ordinated policy in his nomination of suitable clergymen. A

---

1. He was required to produce a certificate of the date of his birth, showing that he was twenty-four years of age. (GLMS. 9535/2, f.45v.).
2. GLMS. 9531/13,ff.259v.-260r. Aylmer immediately issued another mandate, authorising two canon residentiaries to perform the induction. Nowell's objections were not legally tenable,for Aylmer was over twenty-six on his collation in 1591, a year older than the minimum age laid down in canon law for holding an archdeaconry (W.G.F.Phillimore, The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England (1895),1,199. Nowell's explanation,however, that "...dictum magistrum Theophilum Aylmer fuisse et esse ad modum Iuvinem, Curiam Doctorum seniorum eidem Archimatui spectantium in se assumere,..." suggests that his objections were more than purely legal.
3. GLMS. 9535/2, f.73r.

man's length of service and his previous pastoral record was often subordinated to the pressure of interested parties, of friends, kinsmen, and favourites. The extent of ministerial maturity in London was therefore less a deliberate than an accidental product of contemporary ecclesiastical politics.

Precise details of age can be traced for those incumbents who were ordained in the diocese of London and for those graduates whose age on matriculation was entered in the university lists.[1] By these means, it is possible to account for 165 of the City incumbents of the period, over one-third of the total. Inadequate as this is, the figures can be utilised to show to some extent in tabular form, firstly their ages on admission to a living, and secondly their ages at certain dates within the period.

---

1. In the ordination lists circiter, or sometimes 'et ultra' is frequently found with the details of age, but where it has been possible to check them, they have been found reliable to within a year; e.g. Sorocold, admitted into Oxford in July 1580 at the age of 18, described himself as 27 on his ordination in December 1588. Wager, ordained in August 1566 aged 29, put himself as 36 (aut circiter) in his deposition before the consistory court in August 1574. Heyney, 18 on his matriculation in 1580, was described as 24 et ultra on his ordination in 1584. Ephraim Paget, 18 on his matriculation in May 1593, was 25 et ultra on his ordination in June 1599.

Age on Admission[1]

AGE	PRE-1559	1559-70	1571-80	1581-90	1591-1603
25 or under	-	7	3	6	3
26 - 35	1	27	13	19	28
36 - 45	1	14	6	5	13
46 - 55	2	6	-	2	3
Over 55	1	3	-	2	-

A sprinkling of very young incumbents existed throughout the period, the youngest recorded being Simon Buttery, aged only twenty-two on his collation by Aylmer to the rectory of St. Anne and St. Agnes in 1577.[2] As a student recently taken from Jesus College Cambridge into the episcopal household in a teaching capacity, his case was exceptional, for only a person enjoying the favour of his bishop could have contrived twice to infringe canonical regulations by entering deacon's orders under age and accepting a benefice while in inferior orders.[3] His advancement, however, is illustrative of the encouragement given by Aylmer to promising young men from the universities, a trait particularly noticeable in his selection of domestic

---

1. i.e. on institution, collation, or donation - not on presentation. When a person held more than one living in London only his age on admission to the earlier one is tabulated.
2. GLMS. 9535/1, f.159v.; Henn. 95. He was exempted from fee-charges on his ordination because of his privileged position.
3. GLMS. 9535/2, f.4v. He took priest's orders a few weeks after he had relinquished his living, and taken up another in Lincolnshire by an unofficial exchange with Edward Edgeworth (The State of the Church...[in] the Diocese of Lincoln, ed. C.W.Foster, Lincoln Rec. Soc.,xxiii,(1926),68).

chaplains.[1]

Episcopal favour on the part both of Aylmer and his predecessor, Grindal, accounted for the preferment of some but by no means all of those who held livings by the age of twenty-five.[2] Richard Bosom[3] and Richard Allen[4] were doubtless given the opportunity only by virtue of the chronic shortage of clergy in 1560, while Anthony Silliard[5] and Nicholas Standen[6] owed their preferment to the influence of interested lay parties. On the whole, they were well-qualified academically, only Allen, Bosom, and John Philpot, a protégé of Grindal, not having received a university education; but their almost total lack of pastoral experience was a major handicap in the hurly-burly of London ecclesiastical politics. In the case of Standen, Philpot, Allen and to a lesser extent Henry Bedell, their youth may, as

---

1. George Dickens, William Hutchinson, and William Cotton, inter alia, were all recent university recruits on obtaining positions in Aylmer's household, and owed their later preferment to his patronage.
2. Other examples were Philpot, John Simpson and Bedell.
3. Ordained deacon and priest in 1560 (aged 23), P C. of St. Botolph Aldersgate 1560 (Mullins, 279); P C. of St. Botolph Aldgate 1561-c.1563 (Lambeth MS. Tenison 711, No. 19). He neither preached nor understood Latin in 1561 (ibid)
4. Ord. d. and p. 1560. P C. of St. Katherine Cree 1560 (aged 24.)
5. Aged 24, he was presented to the vicarage of St. Mary Islington by a layman, William Silliard, presumably a relative (Henn.230).
6. Curate of St. Margaret Pattens before he was 25, he obtained the same living through the pressure of the parishioners on the Lord Mayor, the patron. (LCRO.Rep.,16,f.422r.).

Anglican apologists were quick to point out,[1] have accounted for the vehemence of their Puritan opinions,[2] their persistent nonconformity annulling prospects of further preferment within the established church. Even the more orthodox elements in the age-group, however, achieved little distinction, with the exception of Thomas Tymme, author, inter alia, of "A Silver Watch-Bell;[3] all in all, the obscurity of the majority, as they passed their lives often in a mean perpetual curacy in the City,[4] retiring later to a rural benefice, did not justify the expectations of their early patrons in preferring them at such a tender age.

The next age-group, those between twenty-six and thirty-five years old, appears to have been a popular one for recruits to the London ministry. Fashionable with patrons, it was doubtless also beneficial as far as the well-being of the church was concerned, for most of the incumbents entered their livings

---

1. "A great part of the troubles of the church of England," declared Stephen Gosson in 1598, "hath sprung out of greene heads, that have much busied themselves about the state of bishops, those are young cockerels..." (The Trumpet of Warre (1598),87).
2. Philpot and Standen lost their benefices, Allen his lectureship in the vestiarian controversy. Bedell ultimately subscribed
3. This was a popular devotional work that reached a nineteenth edition in 1659 (DNB.)
4. e.g. Gervase Walker, P C. ofAll Hallows Staining 1591, V. of Great Staughton, Hunts. 1594-1617 (Alumni Cantab. 1,iv,316); Thomas Richardson, P C. of St. Benet Finck 1585-1606, V. of High Easter, Essex 1608 (ibid.1,iii,454); David English, perpetual curate of three London livings before retiring to Stepney, and later to Sussex. (Henn.lxxii, note j.26).

equipped with a certain amount of experience, either in country cures, or, very often, in unbeneficed clerical positions in the city itself. A period as a curate to a parson who was often non-resident, leaving his assistant to bear the responsibilities of the cure, was a valuable, even if frustrating, form of apprenticeship for a City incumbency, particularly if the curate eventually managed to succeed the incumbent. James Stopes, ordained by Aylmer in 1577 aged twenty-five, served as a schoolmaster and a curate in various City parishes for some years,[1] until he was settled by 1583 as curate of St. Mary Magdalene Old Milk Street, where three years later he was collated to the living by the dean and chapter of St. Paul's.[2] Samson Masheder was a curate for at least three years before he secured the presentation to the Crown living of St. George Botolph Lane at the age of twenty-nine.[3] Thomas Sorocold moved from his native Lancashire to London for his priestly ordination, and occupied himself for three years as an assistant curate until his institution to St. Mildred Poultry when he was still under thirty years of age.[4]

Other served their apprenticeship elsewhere. Included

---

1. GLMS. 9535/1, f.156.r.; LCRO. Lib. V.G.Hamond, f.87v.
2. GLMS. 9535/5, [no. fol.]; Henn.319.
3. GLMS. 1175/1 [no. fol.]; Henn.109.
4. GLMS. 9535/2, f.43v. Henn.285.

within this age-group was Lancelot Andrewes who came to London with his reputation already established by his catechismal lectures at Cambridge, and his chaplaincy to the Earl of Huntingdon.[1] Andrew Janeway, was perpetual curate of Titley in Essex for four years before his admission as priest at the age of twenty-eight on his institution to the rectory of All Hallows London Wall.[2] Meredith Hanmer was thirty-five years old and had already held livings in Flintshire and Surrey before he was presented by Archdeacon Mullins to St. Leonard Shoreditch John Dove, who for years had been resigned "...to die within the precintes of the colledge, like a monke shut up in his cell, or an heremite mured up within the compasse of a wall...,[4] was collated at the age of thirty-five by Whitgift to the important rectory of St. Mary Aldermary after a short tenure of a Wiltshir living.[5] A few, whose circumstances were exceptional, contrived to secure a living without any previously pastoral experience; John Lysby, for instance, a man whose chief asset was his fortune in being born in a parish where the inhabitants had a powerful voice in selecting the incumbent, was rushed into both orders in 1568 in order to be presented to his native benefice.[6]

---

1. DNB.
2. GLMS. 9535/2, f.63v.
3. DNB.
4. A Sermon preached at Paul's Crosse (1596), (Sig. A1,f.1v.)
5. Henn. 300.
6. GLMS. 9535/1, f.140r. and v. The parish was St. Margaret Pattens.

Similar pressure may account for the preferment of John Taylor to St. Mary Staining on his ordination in 1567 at the age of thirty-three,[1] but such practices were few and far between.[2]

The older age-groups betray the critical situation facing Parker and Grindal at the outset of the reign, when the dearth of clergy obliged them to admit many of middling age and nondescript quality. The London ordination records reflect the maturity of the ordinands of 1559-1560,[3] their average age contrasting unfavourably with those of their successors. To take one example, the average age of thirty-four men admitted deacons by Grindal on January 14th 1560 amounted to a fraction short of thirty-two;[4] the same number of deacons admitted by Aylmer in two groups in 1577 averaged twenty-seven years of age despite the rise of the minimum age by two years in the meantime.[5] Only a minority of 1559-1560 ordinands obtained livings in the City, but there were enough of them to account for the dichotomy that is apparent in the over-thirty-five age-groups

---

1. Ibid. f.129v, f.130r. He was commended to the Lord Chancellor by Grindal (Lansd. MS. 443, f.157v.).
2. Another was James Smith, a graduate, aged 27, who came straight out of Aylmer's household to be collated rector of St. Alphage (GLMS. 9535/2, f.60r.; Henn.86.).
3. 104 deacons were admitted in three large groups on January 14th, January 25th, and April 25th, 1560. Details of age are given in 90 cases; 31 were below 30 years of age; 42 between 30-39; 12 between 40-49; 4 in their fifties; and one was aged 60. (GLMS. 9535/1, ff.83r-89v. passim).
4. Ibid. ff.83r.-84r.
5. Ibid. ff.152v.-153r., f.156r. and v.

between those clerics who came to London when they were approaching middle age, with half a lifetime of pastoral experience behind them, and those of a similar age but lacking more than fragmentary previous service. This latter group, amounting to about twenty in all, were almost all archiepiscopal or Grindalian ordinands who had managed to secure preferment in the first decade of the reign.[1] Hugh Brady was thirty-six years old on his institution to the rectory of All Hallows Honey Lane shortly after his ordination in 1560.[2] His contemporary at St. Leonard Shoreditch, John Dane, was fifty-three years of age before he entered the ministry, and some months older on his preferment; three years later he was dead.[3] Another 1560 ordinand, Thomas Pemberton, was past his half century on his collation to St. Michael le Querne.[4] The enthusiasm of these somewhat venerable ordinands, many of whom had doubtless been fired to enter the ministry by the re-

---

1. They were James Reniger, Hugh Brady, James Cooke, John Johnson, William Atkinson, William Farmer, John Dane, Alexander Smelley, Thomas Pemberton, John Askew, Robert Rogerson, Richard Weston, Thomas Earl, John Gough, Giles Seyntcler, Richard Wilmot, Walter Haynes, Richard Caser, (not instituted to a London benefice until 1582), Thomas Gattacre (instituted 1572), John Scarlet, Henry Fletcher (instituted 1586), John Pitts (instituted 1571). A few of these - Johnson, Caser, Gattacre, Fletcher, and Pitts - served unbeneficed apprenticeships of varying length, but the majority were admitted to livings on or shortly after their entry into the ministry.
2. GLMS. 9535/1, f.97r.; Henn.77.
3. GLMS. 9535/1, f.85r.; Henn.393.
4. GLMS. 9535/1, f.99v.; Henn.436.

establishment of the reformed faith, cannot be questioned, but their age, their pastoral inexperience, and their frequent educational shortcomings,[1] made most of them a dubious asset in a city where the growth of puritan nonconformity demanded an Anglican ministry equal to its challenge.

By no means all the incumbents in the thirty-six and over age group can be placed in this category. The church in London could benefit considerably from the accumulated experience of men who had already spent years of service elsewhere in the country, or had taught at the universities and now could resist no longer the magnetism of London. Nicholas Balgay had occupied himself in Wiltshire, and had attained to the position of sub-dean of Salisbury Cathedral before his institution to the first of his London livings at the age of forty-nine.[2] Richard Bancroft, Samuel Harsnet and John King, two of whom were to become archbishops, and the other bishop of London, all had considerably pastoral and administrative experience as chaplains to bishops and special commissioners, before they took London livings in their late thirties.[3] Numerous other instances of clergymen, with their reputations already

---

1. Of the 22, 4 possessed university degrees (Brady, Fletcher, Seyntcler, Scarlet), and 2 others had spent some time in a university (Farmer, Gattacre.)
2. Alumni Oxon, 1,1,61.
3. Bancroft was at one time chaplain to Cox, Bishop of Ely; Harsnet to Bancroft, Bishop of London; and King to Piers, Archbishop of York.

established, enriching church life in the City by taking up preferments there, can be provided;[1] perhaps the most notable recruit and the oldest of them all was Miles Coverdale.[2] The most conclusive evidence of the attraction of London to the elderly as well as to the young, however, may well have been the decision of Richard Greenham to give up his long-held Leicestershire vicarage in order to preach in City pulpits 'for the general good' when he was in his middle fifties;[3] his succumbing to the plague three years later was a fate that constituted part of the risk of a London preferment.[4]

The details of their ages, blended and expanded by biographical data of their careers, on the whole suggest that with two important exceptions, the clergy admitted to London livings during this period tended to have substantial periods of clerical service behind them, often in assistant curacies or other unbeneficed positions in the city, in rural parsonages or cures, or, occasionally, in their capacity as chaplains to

---

1. e.g. Stephen Gosson, the dramatist turned priest; Henry Holland, editor of Greenham's works; John May, later bishop of Carlisle.
2. He was collated by Grindal to St. Magnus, officially the wealthiest of the London benefices, in 1563 at the age of 75, but resigned it three years later during the vestiarian controversy.
3. DNB.
4. Fuller and Clarke disagreed on this point; the former attributed Greenham's death to the plague of 1592, the other claimed he died in 1591, 'being quite worn out'. (DNB.). In fact, he was still preaching at Christ Church in 1593 (GLMS. 9163,f.305r.). The administration of his goods was granted to his widow on April 30th, 1594 (LCCRO. Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.174r.)

ecclesiastical dignitaries. One exception was created by the periodic custom usually on the part of the London bishop to installvery young men who had achieved prominence in the university, or favour in the episcopal household, but their numbers do not appear to have been considerable. More serious, contradicting the idea that experience necessarily came with the accumulation of years, was the allowance into the ministry at the outset of the reign of men mature in age but often less well-equipped in qualification. Their distribution, widespread during Grindal's episcopacy, steadily dwindled as time took its toll.

The following table may give a more specific indication of the age-grouping at given dates of those incumbents concerning whom details are available.[1]

AGE	1560	1570	1580	1590	1600
25 and under	1	-	-	2	1
26 - 35	1	13	5	12	10
36 - 45	8	8	13	7	25
46 - 55	1	6	7	15	6
56 - 65	2	1	3	7	9
Over 65	3	2	-	1	2

1. Incumbents holding more than one living at any of these dates, are only once recorded.

In the light of the earlier evidence, this table is useful in showing the strength of the middle-aged element among the City incumbents at a given date. It also suggests a fair sprinkling of elderly men holding livings which in many cases were yielded up only on their death. Two tendencies, neither invariable, are evident. The more favoured clergy, those holding chaplaincies to influential patrons, or with a powerful voice in a cathedral chapter or episcopal household, were rarely anxious to end their lives in London, and showed little reluctance to move out to a comfortable country living, or to a lucrative cathedral dignity. Promotion to an archdeaconry, a deanery, or even better, usually fell to this class of clergy,[1] a factor that accounted for many retirements from London. Two successive vicars of All Hallows Barking, a substantial vicarage used by the archbishop of Canterbury to support his protégés, departed after a seven year incumbency, the one to an Essex living and a canonry at Canterbury,[2] the other to his deanship of Christ Church, Oxford.[3] Arthur Williams, after close on twenty years pastorate in London and elsewhere, returned to his native Wales, and eventually became precentor

---

1. London's reputation as a nursery ground for future bishops, - at least 18 incumbents attained to episcopal (or higher) rank, -, is discussed in Chapter III.
2. Richard Wood (Alumni Cantab.1,iv,454.).
3. Thomas Ravis (Alumni Oxon.1,iii,1235.). In 1607 he returned to London as its bishop.

of Bangor cathedral[1] Arthur Bright, after seventeen vigorous years in various City livings and preaching positions, was glad to secure by exchange the Essex rectory of Great Wigborough;[2] Meredith Hanmer gave up his London benefice in his mid-forties, and spent his remaining dozen years profitably in Ireland:[3] William Cotton at the age of forty-eight gave up the rectory he had held for more than twenty years to become bishop of Exeter:[4] Henry Withers at the age of fifty retired from his City parish to Theydon Garnon in Essex where he spent the last eighteen years of his life.[5]

Promotion fell, however, only to the favoured few, and it was not easy to make arrangements for a transfer, by exchange or otherwise, out ofLondon as the years advanced and the burdens of ministry were less lightly borne. Many of the clergy therefore clung on to their City livings until their death, some no doubt out of preference,[6] but the majority, with no prospect

---

1. The Diocese of Bangor in the Sixteenth Century, compiled by A.J.Pryce (Bangor 1923), 35.
2. Alumni Cantab. i,i,218.
3. DNB.
4. Ibid.
5. Alumni Oxon. i,iv,1664.
6. The incumbents of the two most valued benefices - St. Magnus and St. Dunstan in the East - were naturally the most loath to surrender them, particularly as the holders were often senior dignitaries who were able to enjoy their fruits as non-residents, or in commendam. 4 of the 7 Elizabethan incumbents of St. Dunstan held the living until their death, two of the others resigning on becoming bishops.

of an alternative, out of necessity. If they could avoid the plague, - and ministerial absenteeism from the capital during outbreaks provided ample material for Puritan critics[1] -, the clergy often displayed a remarkable resilence. An incumbency covering thirty years was not uncommon;[2] occasionally a further decade was reached, as in the case of Thomas Earl, rector of St. Mildred Bread Street 1564-1604, who was aged about eighty-five on his death.[3] Late in life, Earl wrote his own epitaph, boasting, with some justification, that "...I was never in 36 yeres XII dayes out of towne or non Resydent", and recalling the occasions he had helped out his brother clergy in time of plague, "...and non for monyes. I was no mony gatherer."[4] His was a proud record of humble service, but he was not the longest lived of the Elizabethan incumbents: the celebrated Dr. Willoughby, rector of St. Michael Cornhill, was about ninety years old on his resignation of the living in 1562.[5] A senile incumbent, not removable from his freehold tenure, was a liability to the church, under microscopic examination as it was

---

1. cf. Anthony Gilby's criticisms in his A pleasant dialogue betweenea souldior of Barwicke and an English chaplaine. (Quoted by M.M.Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago 1939), 202).
2. e.g. Th. Staller (R. of All Hallow Lombard St. 1573-1606); John Johnson (R. of St. Andrew Undershaft 1565-1596); Robert Clay (R. of St. Leonard Foster Lane 1574-1603); Th. Jenkinson (R. of St. Mary Woolchurch 1560-1593).
3. He described himself as about 66 years old in 1585. (LCCRO. Commissary Ct.1581-93 [no fol.],20th Oct.1585).
4. CUL. MS.Mm. 1,29,f.44v.
5. He was said to be almost 100 years old in 1572 (Mullins,437).

from Puritan critics, and occasionally the bishop was obliged to call for a coadjutor.[1] Nevertheless, much benefit both to ministry and to people must have resulted from these numerous long-term incumbencies, particularly where the parson was single-beneficed and a permanent resident, benefits in terms of human relationship that were none the less enduring for the non-survival of their details.

---

1. Robert Towne, one of Parker's 1559-60 ordinands, petitioned the bishop for a coadjutor for his rectory of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey in 1597, on account of his age (65 et ultra), and because he was "...debilem, decrepitum, et imbecillem." (LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, ii, f.328r.) Bancroft in his 1598 visitation ordered the allocation of a coadjutor for Hugh Andrews, the septuagarian rector of St. John Zachary (GLMS. 9537/9, f.159v.).

CHAPTER THREE

EDUCATION AND LEARNING.

No aspect of Elizabethan ecclesiastical activity afforded more scope to contemporary critics than the educational standards of its ministry. The ignorance of the clergy, their lack of knowledge, either of the scriptures or of Latin, constituted a favourite theme with both Puritan[1] and Catholic[2] controversialists, as with less partisan commentators at Paul's Cross.[3] In the early years of the reign, even official Anglican apologists were unable to refute these charges: "Would God it were not true!" lamented Bishop Jewel in 1562, "...But alas! are we able to make learned men upon the sudden? Or can we make others than come unto us, or will come to live in misery?"[4] As the reign progressed, Puritan documentation of unfit ministers was challenged by the increasing assertiveness of Anglican protagonists, growing ever more confident as the quality of ordinands improved, and as the policies of the hierarchy to reduce the shortcomings of the inferior clergy by means of

---

1. cf. SP.i,257; ii,178,197.
2. cf. J.Calfhill, An Answer to John Martiall's Treatise of the Cross, ed. R.Gibbings, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1846), 51.
3. e.g. James Bisse, Two Sermons...the one at Paules Cross (1580), 65-7; John Walsal, A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse (1578), f.1r.; J. Dove, A Sermon preached at Paules Cross (1594), ff.4r-5r.
4. The Works of John Jewel, ed. J.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1850), iv,910.

compulsory instruction, became more ambitious and comprehensive. By 1588, a M.P. could give, as an objection to the Puritan bill against pluralities, the reason that "It will be the utter overthrow of a learned ministry, which now flourisheth in England more than it ever did: and bring in a barberous unlearned, and factious ministry."[1]

Historians on the whole have accepted the picture presented by the critics rather than the apologists; particularly weighty is the judgement arrived at by W.P.M. Kennedy, hardly a Puritan sympathiser:

> "...the uniform record of complaints justifies us in concluding that the wast majority of them were men of small intellectual attainments, and the fact that they were ceaselessly urged to study in certain directions goes far to prove that the standard of learning was generally low among them".[2]

More recent research has been based less on the visitation articles and injunctions used by Kennedy than on the more reliable and more exhaustive certificates of the clergy that issued from periodical diocesan surveys. As might be expected, local factors within each diocese - the personality of the bishop, the distribution of patronage, the state of parochial

---

1. Strype, Whitgift, i, 534. According to Strype, the argument was probably suggested to the speaker by the archbishop.
2. W.P.M.Kennedy, Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth (1914), 36.

revenues, proximity to a university, - resulted in a wide disparity in standards that compels caution about generalisations before all dioceses have been explored. In 1560, 19% of the clergy of Worcester diocese were university graduates,[1] only half the Oxford diocesan proportion at the same date.[2] One out of every five in Devon was a graduate in 1561,[3] whereas the figure in Lichfield and Coventry diocese as late as 1602-3 was only 24%.[4] In Norwich in 1592-3, 49% of the clergy were graduates;[5] the proportion in the dioceses of York and Chester at the same time was less than one-third.[6] Canon Foster has shown that standards even fluctuated between archdeaconries in the same diocese, a comment on the intensely local influences affecting the quality of the clergy; in the archdeaconry of Lincoln and Stow, for instance, the proportion of graduates amounted to about 27% in 1585, rising to some 37% by 1603,[7] whereas in the archdeaconry of Leicester, part of the same diocese of Lincoln, the approximate figures for the same years

---

1. Hill, 207, note 1.
2. Ibid.
3. A.L.Rowse, Tudor Cornwall (1941), 324.
4. An Elizabethan Clergy List of the Diocese of Lichfield, compiled by J.C.Cox, Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Soc. Journal, vi,158.
5. A List of the Clergy of Norfolk and their Status, communicated by H.W.Saunders, Original Papers of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaelogical Soc. xviii, pt.1, 81-2.
6. Hill, 207, note 1.
7. The State of the Church...[in] The Diocese of Lincoln, ed. C.W.Foster, Lincoln Record Soc. 23 (1926), lxviii.

were 31% and 58%.[1] Such conclusions as may be reached for London, therefore, bear no wider significance for the country as a whole, reflecting only the attraction of the capital to the well-qualified. Bearing these local factors in mind, we can now determine how far Kennedy's obiter dicta stand up to the London test, or whether Professor Sykes' picture of the gravitation of "...the best abilities of the Church" towards the capital in the eighteenth century[2] was no less true two hundred years earlier.

Archivally, London has been less generously treated than many other dioceses. Apart from surveys made in 1560, 1561, and 1563, no certificates of the clergy have survived, and we are thus denied the detailed analysis of their educational qualifications and the standard of their learning available for other areas in the certificates of 1576, 1586, 1592-3 and 1603.[3] Consequently, the possession of a university degree must remain the one constant criterion of a clergyman's intellectual endowment. Whitgift's complaint to the Lord Treasurer in 1589 that "...the University giveth degrees and honours to the

---

1. Ibid. lviii. In the whole diocese, 399 out of 1285 had degrees in 1585, 646 out of 1,184 in 1603 (ibid. lvii).
2. N.Sykes, Church and State in the Eighteenth Century (1931), 227, 254.
3. The bulk of this material is in Lambeth Chartae Miscellaneae, xii, xiii. The 1576 certificates include returns for the rural parts of London diocese, but not for the archdeaconry of London.

unlearned; and the Church is filled with ignorant Ministers, being for the most part poor scholars", indicates that a degree was not an absolute criterion of learning.[1] This is also suggested by the unversity dispensations available to cover non-attendance at lectures, or disputations, or to qualify a student to proceed to a degree in less than the minimum period of residence stipulated in the regulations.[2] Nevertheless, the possession of a degree constitutes the most consistent guide to an incumbent's state of learning. The survival of the 1561 Certificates for London[3] enables us to check the educational standards of the clergy with their academic qualifications; only one graduate - a veteran of almost forty years' incumbency - was classified as '*indoctus*'[4], while three non-graduates obtained a '*doctus*' description.[5] With these exceptions, none of the graduate incumbents received a less satisfactory report on the state of his knowledge of Latin, Greek and the scriptures.

The standard adopted by the ecclesiastical authorities in determining whether a man was fit to enter the ministry and

---

1. Strype, *Whitgift*, i,610, cf. R.G.Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church* (1910),i,208-9.
2. *Register of the University of Oxford*, ed. A.Clarke (Oxford 1887),ii,Pt.1,9-27 *passim*.
3. Parker Certificates, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 122,pp.72-97; transcribed by Mullins, 269-285.
4. Thomas Genins (Jenins) rector of St. Michael Wood St. since 1524 (*ibid*.271; Henn,336). He was a B.C.L.
5. William Baldwin, Thomas Walbutt, John Philpot (Mullins,269, 271,282).

hold a living, were essentially empirical, governed by the supply of recruits at any particular time. The shortage of available clergy in the early years of the reign sometimes brought down standards to minimum levels of literacy; as the situation gradually eased with the improvement in the supply of university recruits, it was found imperative to redeem the policies that had allowed ill-qualified men to be ordained, by means of compulsory instruction in the scriptures of all the parish clergy who lacked either a degree or a preaching licence. By the later part of the reign, a ministry of exclusively university-trained men was a topical ideal, if not a realistic aim; in practice, the responsibility lay with patrons whose motives were not always altruistic, and ultimately with the bishops whose criteria of suitability for the ministry were rarely consistent. The different policies followed by the authorities in their treatment of graduates and non-graduate clergymen justify a separate discussion of the two classes.

(i) THE GRADUATE INCUMBENT

Before analysing the distribution of graduates among the beneficed clergy, some impression of the practical advantages attaining to the holder of a university degree must be formed. A master of arts was exempted from the increasingly intensive courses of scriptural instruction compulsory for ministers without a degree or a preaching licence. A fellow of a college or a master of arts, resident in his college, was not restricted

in his choice of diocese for ordination, and was not liable to the requirements of a title to a cure of souls. Henry VIII's statute of 1529 allowed graduates in divinity, civil law, and canon law to hold in plurality,[1] a privilege extended by the canons of 1604 to include masters of arts and publicly-licensed preachers.[2] An even more substantial incentive was the regulation imposed by the 1571 Act[3] and followed in subsequent constitutions,[4] disallowing ministers who were neither bachelors of divinity nor preachers licensed by a bishop or one of the universities from holding benefices valued at or over £30 in the Queen's Books. Intended as an inducement to gifted university students to choose the church as a career, the validity of the act in practice was limited by the increase in the value of livings in London since the assessment of 1535, still in use for official purposes.[5] It was also far easier to obtain a preaching licence from the local bishop than a degree in divinity, an inconsistency in the terms of the act that sometimes allowed inadequately qualified clergymen to hold such livings. A bill in the Parliament of 1586 recognised this loophole, and unsuccessfully sought to redeem it by confining benefices over £30 in value to graduates in divinity

---

1. The Statutes of the Realm, iii (1817), 294 (21 H.VIII, c.13.
2. No. XLI. (Card. Synod. i.271.).
3. Statutes, iv, 547 (13 Eliz.c.12.).
4. e.g. 1575, No.VII (Card. Synod. i, 135-6.).
5. cf. Chapter VII. sub Value of Livings.

or masters of arts of five years standing.[1]

Eleven of the fifteen London benefices coming under the terms of the 1571 act were in the gift of ecclesiastical patrons,[2] a factor no doubt largely responsible for the careful adherence to its stipulations. The great majority of the incumbents qualified for their positions by virtue of their degrees in divinity, twenty-four of the thirty instituted post-1571 being either bachelors or doctors in theology;[3] the remaining half a dozen were all graduates and licensed preachers.

While the anachronistic rate of assessment ensured that no more than fifteen of London livings could claim, after 1571, a statutory right to a learned incumbent, a far larger number were lucrative enough in practice to attract virtually a continuous succession of graduate clergymen. Neither the value of the benefice nor the disposition of the patron was an exclusively decisive factor, but taken in conjunction they did most to determine the quality of the clergy. The archbishop

---

1. SP.,ii,197.
2. All Hallows Barking, All Hallows Bread St., All Hallows the Great, St. Dunstan East, St. Giles Cripplegate, St. Margaret New Fish St., St. Magnus, St. Martin Ludgate, St. Mary Aldermary, St. Mary le Bow, and St. Vedast. The remaining four were St. Dunstan West, St. Mary Hill, St. Michael Cornhill and St. Peter Cornhill, in the gift respectively of the Sackville family, private hands, Drapers' Company and the Lord Mayor and Corporation.
3. The six exceptions were William Cotton, Thomas Crowe, Humphrey Cole, George Dickens, Josua Gilpin, and, somewhat surprisingly, Lancelot Andrewes.

was fortunate in holding a group of important benefices in the city, most of them comfortably endowed,[1] and it is significant that only the two poorest of the Canterbury peculiars - Holy Trinity the Less and St. Mary Bothaw - attracted less than a majority of graduate incumbents.[2] The others often provided convenient preferment and useful City pulpits for the archbishop's chaplains, hand-picked after illustrious university careers.

No other London patron could boast of a comparative group of well-endowed livings. Those in the gift of the bishop fluctuated from the one extreme of St. Magnus, the most valued benefice in the Valor,[3] to the poverty-stricken parishes of St. Anne and Agnes, and St. Clement Eastcheap.[4] While he was as careful as the archbishop in making the wealthier of them a preserve for his own chaplains and protégés,[5] his difficulty in obtaining suitable men for livings that were barely above subsistence level, was reflected both in the rapid changes of

---

1. 5 of the 15 benefices valued at £30, were peculiars of the archbishop, who also obtained the presentative patronage of two others during the course of the reign.
2. Both these livings were in the gift of the dean and chapter of Canterbury. 1 out of the 3 Elizabethan incumbents of Holy Trinity (valued at £8.7s.) was a graduate, as were 4 of the 11 rectors of St. Mary (worth £10.10s.). (V.E.,i,371.)
3. Valued at £67.12s. (V.E.,i,373.).
4. Worth £8 and £13.2s. respectively, in 1535 (ibid.i,375.).
5. e.g. at St. Magnus, all 4 Elizabethan incumbents were university products, as were all 3 at St. Margaret New Fish St., and all 4 at St. James Garlickhythe.

incumbents and in the necessity to admit men who could claim no higher formal qualification than a state of literacy.[1] Similar problems confronted the dean and chapter of St. Paul's, the remaining important ecclesiastical patron in London; they tended to retain the more attractive livings for their own use,[2] and sometimes disposed of the poorest by rewarding the curate, a man perhaps with several years of unbeneficed service behind him but rarely possessing academic qualifications.[3]

Despite the temptation of private arrangements and reciprocal favours, ecclesiastical patrons were on the whole conscious - if only because of the exposed nature of their position - of the responsbilities they bore towards improving the learning of the ministry. Lay patrons were not under the same compulsion, and were more able to take other factors into consideration. The attack on simoniacal practices was directed principally against private lay patrons who used their rights of presentation as a commercial asset.[4] The purchase and exchange of advowsons, for a life, or, more commonly, pro hac vice, were both most possible and most popular among private

---

1. e.g. only 2 out of 8 rectors of St. Anne and Agnes possessed degrees (Edgeworth and King); 3 out of 7 in St.Clement Eastcheap (Carr, Hailes, and Nicholson); 4 out of 7 in Ethelburgha(Dawes, Thorpe, Simpson, and Bedwell).
2. e.g. St. Michael Bassishaw, St. Michael le Querne, St. Botolph Billingsgate; St. Giles Cripplegate.
3. e.g. William Toft served for almost a decade as curate of St John Zachary before his collation to the living. This form of preferment grew rarer as competition for livings intensified during the later part of the reign. (cf. infra, pp.[illegible])
4. SP.ii,166; J.Dove, A Sermon preached at Paul's Crosse (1594) ff.4v.-5r. James Bisse, Two Sermons preached...1580,65: "Livings are not geven, they are solde as common as oysters at Billingsgate."

patrons, anxious to install kinsmen or associates who found difficulty in obtaining a more orthodox form of presentation.[1] With so many personal factors involved, the qualifications of the clergy tended to take second place, and standards inevitably suffered in consequence. Pressure from the local inhabitants on the patron, whether it be the City corporation, the Lord Chancellor, (who disposed of Crown livings under £20 in value), or a private citizen, accounted for the admission of several clergymen of nondescript quality into City livings.[2] The fact that the benefices in lay hands were on the whole less well-endowed than those held by ecclesiastical patrons also explained the larger proportion of non-graduate incumbents in the former type of living. The Lord Chancellor in particular was handicapped by the poverty of several of the benefices in his gift; the presentation of graduates to such parishes as All Hallows in the Wall, St. George Botolph Lane, and St. Mary Staining, valued respectively at £8.7s, £8 and £5.6s.,[3] was a task generally beyond the most altruistically-minded of chancellors, until the improvement of the supply from the universities in the later part of the reign began to produce

---

1. cf. infra, pp. 280-5
2. e.g. John Lisby, William Morrell at St. Margaret Pattens
3. VE, 1,374-5.

results in the meanest of livings.[1]

The worst afflicted of the London parishes were the perpetual curacies, served by ministers dependent on a stipend from the impropriate or appropriate rectors that had been apportioned out either before or at the dissolution of the monasteries. Unless he could exploit his preaching abilities, or was subsidised by parochial benevolences, the perpetual curate did not, unlike his rectorial and vicarial contemporaries, benefit from the increase in the real value of his living during the century; this was a deterrent to all but the most importunate or the occasional graduate looking for temporary employment while awaiting better preferment. While seven out of the eleven known incumbents of St. Ann Blackfriars,[2] and eight out of twelve at St. Mary Aldermanbury were graduates,[3] a proportion that superficially compared favourably with that of many of the poorer-endowed rectories, only one of the first group and three of the second remained for longer than three years, the majority moving as soon as possible to a less insecure preferment.[4] At

---

1. The first graduate incumbent of All Hallows was instituted in 1593; the 2 graduates at St.George were in possession 1584-84, and 1597-1603 respectively; both the graduates at St. Mary were instituted post-1580 (Henn. 83, 110, 338).
2. Thomas Spering, Christopher Watson, Richard Bond, David Dee, George Smith, David English, and Andrew Tirrinte.
3. John Bacter, John Presse, Richard Carr, Hosua Gilpin, Robert Blithman, Christopher Blithman, Michael Salford, and Robert Harland.
4. e.g. Spering (R. of St. Mary Magdalene Milk St.), Dee (R. of St. Barts. Great); Presse (R. of St. Matthew Friday St.); Rob. Blithman (R. of Wargrave, Berks.).

the other end of the scale, only one of ten known perpetual curates of St. James Clerkenwell,[1] and three out of eleven at St. Katherine Cree[2] were trained in a university, a proportion that was far below the London average.

With this background picture of the influences affecting the infiltration of graduates into London livings, we can now more closely analyse their distribution and their proportionate increase during the course of the reign. This can best be indicated in tabular form.

GRADUATES AND THEIR DEGREES

Date	Occupied Livings[3]	Incumbents[4]	Details Unknown[5]	Total of Graduates[6]	D.D.	B.D.	B.C.L.	M.A.	B.A.
1560	104	94	7	44	3	10	7	16	8
1566	108	102	15	42	3	8	4	17	10
1571	109	103	14	45	4	7	2	17	15
1577	109	97	5	55	2	10	1	29	13
1583	110	95	3	58	5	6	-	35	12
1589	110	95	1	58	7	5	-	35	11
1595	111	96	-	69	7	14	-	38	10
1601	111	96	1	72	12	17	-	33	10

---

1. Henry Fletcher.
2. John Argall, David Dee, David English.
3. The maximum was 111. After 1566, vacant livings did not present a problem in London
4. The existence of pluralism in London accounts for the difference between the totals of incumbents and of occupied parishes.

[Footnotes continued overlea

5. These lacunae are almost invariably in parishes where the form of admission makes it most difficult to ascertain the name of the incumbent, ie. the 13 perpetual curacies and the 21 benefices in the collation of the dean and chapter of St. Paul's (whose act-books have not survived). The existence of the 1560 Certificates explains the fewer gaps for that year. Post-1577, the existence of diocesan faculty books recording licences to serve perpetual curacies, and the increase in the number of surviving parish records, enable us to circumvent these obstacles almost completely.

6. The bulk of this information has been drawn from the register of Oxford and Cambridge universities. This source, admittedly incomplete for this period, has been supplemented by particulars of qualifications found in the ordination records or the institution books of the bishop of London.

7. A degree in divinity inferred a degree in arts, for theology was a post-graduate study (Reg. Oxon, ii, i, 132). Several pre-Elizabethan graduates in theology, however, do not appear to have held arts degrees: e.g. John Weale, James Proctor, Edward Ryley, Humphrey Perkins.

272 of the clergy in possession of livings in London during the Elizabethan period are known to have been university graduates. Two of them may possibly have been products of a Scottish university,[1] and one was given his only traceable degree by the university of Basle.[2] Thirty-four claimed to be graduates, but cannot be identified in the English university lists.[3] The remainder received degrees at either Oxford or Cambridge, eighty-eight in the former university, 149 in the latter. These figures bring out the insularity of the educational background of the London clergy; with the exception of the Basle case, only one Englishman is known to have received a continental degree,[4] despite the association of several of the incumbents with Strasbourg and Geneva during their exile in Mary's reign. More important was the predominance of Cambridge men among the graduates, a fact attributable less to any

---

1. Robert Richardson and John Morrison; both were Scots and graduates whose names do not appear in the English university lists.
2. James Meadowes, D.D.; he was incorporated into Oxford in 1601 (Alumni 1,iii,998.).
3. In the case of the Clarks, the Smiths, Lloyds, and Scotts, it has sometimes not proved possible to distinguish a London incumbent of that name from the welter of namesakes at a university at about the same time. Others are not recorded in the university registers, but are known from the details of their ordinations and/or admission to a living to have held a degree.
4. Henry Withers; possibly a student at Geneva, M.A. Cambridge, B.D. Oxford, D.D. Wittenberg (Alumni Cantab. 1,iv,444). Two French-born graduate incumbents, Alexander and Veron, presumably obtained degrees at a continental university, but the details are not known.

possible advantage in their patronage rights in London,[1] than to the tendency of Aylmer to look to Cambridge for promising recruits for the City ministry.[2] Cambridge also drew more heavily than her sister university from the London area in her recruitment,[3] and, as has been seen, a strong element of local-mindedness existed among the lay patrons in the capital when they came to nominate their candidates.

The 1560 figures reflected the unsettled state of the ministry in London, as elsewhere, in the opening years of the reign. A striking commentary on the shortage of available clergy was provided by the seven vacant livings, the Lord Chancellor being unable for over three years even to secure a nomination to an adequately furnished benefice like St. John Walbrook.[4] The poverty of the remainder,- with the exception of St. Mary Abchurch where the vacancy was due to the delay in the restoration of the pre-Marian incumbent -, made them particularly

---

1. St. Mary Abchurch and St. Katherine Cree were in the gift of Cambridge colleges. Balliol College, Oxford, was the patron of St. Lawrence Jewry.
2. All the 11 graduates collated by Aylmer to benefices in his gift were from Cambridge.
3. cf. Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, compiled by J.Venn (Cambridge 1897), i,xii-xiii.
4. Vacant 1560-63; valued in the Valor as £15.18s. (VE.i,373).

vulnerable to the dearth of clergy;[1] their gradual occupation during the course of the decade was a tribute to the policy of the ecclesiastical authorities in overcoming the labour shortage.[2]

In London, as we have seen, it was a policy of indiscriminate mass-ordination. Its immediate effects on the quality of the beneficed clergy were grave; while at least half and possibly three-quarters of the London incumbents in 1553 "...had received an education thought sufficient for a degree in arts and divinity,"[3] the number by late 1560 had fallen to forty-four out of a total of ninety-four.[4] At least thirteen of the newly-ordained ministers were in possession of benefices or perpetual curacies in the city; only three of

---

1. St. Nicholas Acon (£14); St. Benet Sherehog (£8.6s.); All Hallows London Wall (£8.7s.); St. Mary Staining (£5.6s.); Holy Trinity Less (£8.7s.). Details of their vacancy are obtained from the Report on the Archdeaconry of London, 1560 (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 122,pp.25-30), transcribed by Mullins, 255-268. I have not included St. Bartholomew Gt., although described as without a rector, for the curate then in charge was later recognised as the rector. The Report deals with 86 of the 111 parishes under survey; no information is available for 10 of the others.
2. After 1566, only three livings were destitute of a parson for any length of time, St. Nicholas Acon probably from 1558-70, St. Benet Sherehog from 1558-1578 (Nicholls was curate, not rector, as stated by Henn. 387), and St. Stephen Coleman St. 1562-c.1592. All three were Crown livings, ~~the fruits falling to the Queen during a vacancy.~~
3. Mullins, 74.
4. The 7 unknown men may of course have included graduates.

them held a university degree.[1] While a few ex-chantry priests, subscribers and non-graduates,[2] were also rewarded, there can be no doubt that the admission of ill-qualified men into the ministry, accepted in large blocs that gave little opportunity for a thorough pre-ordination examination, was most responsible for the decline in the educational standards of the beneficed clergy in the opening years of the reign.

For a decade, the improvement in the quality of the clergy was barely perceptible. While the number of incumbents both in 1566 and 1571 of whom there is either no knowledge, or no means of identification in the university records, is so substantial as to make impossible a definitive assessment, there is little evidence of any distinguishable upward trend. Some of the non-graduate ordinands of 1559-1560, often mature in years on their entry into the ministry, had already by 1566 succumbed to time or to the plague outbreak of 1563, but as they generally held the poorer type of livings, it was as yet difficult to find successors of higher qualifications willing to accept such incumbencies. Robert Rogerson, for instance, who followed Christopher Dix in the £8 Crown living of St. George Botolph

---

1. Richard Beard, Hugh Brady and Thomas Jenkinson. The others were Richard Allen, Brian Barton, Richard Bosum, John Dane, William Locker, John Philpot, Alexander Smelley, Thomas Walbutt, John Gough, and Lewis Harvey.
2. e.g. William Toft, John Polkysson, Patrick Frebarne and John Bacter (Mullins, 218).

Lane, had originally only been accepted into the ministry as a reader during the 1559-60 emergency,[1] while Evans Daniell, made vicar of St. Leonard Shoreditch in 1563, certainly did not appear to have been better equipped than his predecessor, John Dane,[2] The 1566 removals as a result of nonconformist recalcitrance during the vestiarian controversy did, on the other hand, lead to a more enlightened policy on the part of the bishop in the choice of men for key City livings.[3] The eight deprived incumbents, three of whom were graduates and one a scholar,[4] were mostly replaced by university recruits doubtless handpicked for their conformability, who provided an important nucleus of able preachers and disseminators of official policy in the city. Their numbers were too few to have much immediate effect on the distribution of graduates among the incumbents, but they served to anticipate the trends of ecclesiastical policy in the later part of the reign.

By 1577 the improved supply of university recruits,[5] the more discriminate technique practised at the London ordinations, and the attractions peculiar to London, particularly the opportunities for contacting patrons, and of augmenting

---

1. Reg. Parker, 1,339.
2. Neither had a degree. In 1566, the parishioners of Shoreditch brought a case against Daniell, possibly for neglecting his cure, which led to his suspension (LCCRO,Lib.VG. Huick, f.135r. and v.).
3. cf. Chapter X, pp.510-12
4. Crowley, Wiburn and Sinclair held degrees, the 'scholar' was Standen. The others were Sheriff, Gough, Philpot and Lithall.
5. cf. Card. Doc.Annals,ii,6.

official clerical income by lecturing and other by-employments, were all producing results. The drop in the number of untraceable incumbents calls for caution, lest we exaggerate the proportionate increase in the number of graduates since 1571, but the difference is large enough to demand closer inspection. The 1571 act allowing only graduates in divinity or licensed preachers to hold livings valued at £30 or more, was already proving beneficial in the fifteen benefices that came under its terms; Thomas Sackville, for instance, on the death in 1575 of the non-graduate incumbent of St. Dunstan in the West, presented Thomas White, a doctor of divinity distinguished in his day for his learning, and to posterity for his founding of Sion College.[1] Thomas Ware's qualifications were superior to those of his predecessor at St. Mary le Bow,[2] as were those of William Ashbold to Richard Porder at St. Peter Cornhill.[3]

Apart from the statutory obligation, ecclesiastical policy, with Grindal at Canterbury displaying a concern for an improvement in clerical learning that the labour shortage of the early years of his London tenure had forced him to neglect, and Aylmer already exploiting his flair for finding and

---

1. Henn. 138.
2. Ware was a B.D. (D.D. 1581); his predecessor, Robert Coles, a M.A. (Alumni Cantab. 1,iv,337; 1,i,367).
3. Ashbold M.A. (D.D. 1591), Porder B.A.

encouraging able young orthodox divines from the universities, was developing a more positive attitude. Aylmer made the most of the extensive powers of patronage, both direct and indirect, at his command. Expanding a technique that Grindal had used in 1566, he installed men of ability in the important City pulpits at his disposal; often they were his own chaplains or household protégés. Similar collations were made to the cathedral chapter of St. Paul's. An ever-widening group of university-recruited preachers and administrators was thus infiltrating into the city to combat the challenge of Puritanism, at its most dangerous level in London in the post-1577 decade. The process took a decisive turn during Aylmer's episcopal tenure. Thomas Crowe,[1] George Dickens,[2] William Cotton,[3] and William Hutchinson[4] were among the young clerics, clear of any nonconformist suspicions, who were installed as Aylmer's chaplains soon after commencing masters of arts, and received quick preferment to one or more City benefices in an

---

1. M.A. 1571, chaplain 1578, R. of St. James Garlickhithe 1579, of St. Martin Ludgate 1585, (Alumni Cantab, 1,i,428; LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.122r.).
2. M.A. 1576, ordained 1577, chaplain 1578, R. of St. Alban Wood St. 1580, of St. Lawrence Jewry 1581, of St. Mary le Bow 1588 (Alumni Oxon. 1,i,401; Lib. VG. Hamond, f.131r.).
3. M.A. 1575, ordained (priest) 1577 (aged 27), chaplain 1577, R. of St. Margaret New Fish St. 1578, (Alumni Cantab, 1,i,404; Lib. VG. Hamond, f.73r.).
4. M.A. 1576, ordained c.1579, chaplain 1581, R. of St. Christopher Stocks 1581, of St. Botolph Bishopsgate 1584, of St. Michael Bassishaw 1589 (ibid. 1,ii,441).

ecclesiastical gift. Cotton, under Aylmer's patronage, rose steadily up the clerical ladder until his consecration in 1598 as the bishop of Exeter, where his disciplinary methods bore a strong flavour of those of his mentor. Hutchinson became an archdeacon; Dickens and Crowe remained parsons until their death.

Without the advantage of a ready-made situation such as existed in 1566 when eight livings simultaneously fell vacant, the infiltration of men of this type could only be gradual. A moderate endowment of intellectual attainment was no justification for removal from an incumbency, though negligence to follow the course of instructions laid down for the benefit of non-preaching clergy, was used at least once by the London diocesan authorities as a handle for sequestration.[1] Altruistically-minded patrons as a rule had to wait for unsatisfactory incumbents to die or retire from the capital before a more worthy candidate could be recruited. The increase in the number of graduates between 1577 and 1589 was barely perceptible.[2] While the archbishop was setting a high standard and the bishop and chapter of St. Paul's were steadily following suit in all but the poorest livings in their gift,[3] the

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i,f.249r.
2. Between 1577-1589 only one non-graduate was admitted to a living in the archiepiscopal or Canterbury capitular gift - William Merrick, R. of St. Michael Crooked Lane in 1587.
3. Richard Bull (St.Ethelburgh), William Mounkaster and Francis Kitchen (St.Clement Eastcheap) were Aylmer's sole non-graduate collations. 5 non-graduates were admitted to livings in the gift of St. Paul's during these years; James Stopes, John Hinde, Nicholas Kenman, Nicholas Henham, and Hugh Andrews. With the exception of Stopes, all these clerics were incumbents of livings valued at £12 or less.

competition of university recruits for livings in lay patronage was not yet so intensive; the greater vulnerability of private patrons to the pressure of interested parties,[1] and the greater proportion of ill-endowed livings in lay hands doubtless both accounted for this.[2]

The educational standard of the London ministry reached its highest level during the last decade of the century, surpassing the most sanguine accounts of the intellectual quality of the Edwardian clergy,[3] and comparing in distinction with the ministry of the early-eighteenth century.[4] Much of the improvement was due to the widening range of attractions that brought an increased supply of university clergy into the capital, particularly,the existence by 1590 of some thirty parish lectureships.[5] Relatively few non-university trained candidates were now seeking orders,[6] and fewer still were being admitted to livings in London. If we except the perpetual curacies, there were only eight non-graduates among the incumbents admitted post-1590; five of these had spent some

---

1. e.g. Richard Caser, a non-graduate, with useful contacts in the city, was presented in 1582 to the substantial rectory of All Hallows Honey Lane (£19.3s.) by the wardens of the Grocers Co. Caser was brother-in-law to the influential Puritan preacher, Dr. Thomas Crooke (cf. Crooke's will, LCCRO. Consistory Court, Sperin 185).
2. e.g. 3 non-graduates (Masheder, Wm. Rogerson, Francis Roberts) were presented within the space of 5 years to the Crown living of St.George Botolph Lane,officially worth only £8. (VE.1, 375).
3. Mullins, 74.
4. cf. Sykes, op.cit. 227.
5. cf. Chapter VIII.
6. GLMS. 9535/2,ff.49v.-129v. passim.

years at a university without taking a degree,[1] while special considerations influenced the allowance of the remainder.[2] The perpetual curacies were a case apart, not only for their poverty, but also for the tendency among ordinands to take a temporary charge in such cures in order to fulfil the canonical requirements of a title.[3] Even so, the improvement in the ratio of graduates at this time was striking; at All Hallows Staining, for instance, there had only been one graduate among the six known curates pre-1589;[4] between 1589-1603, four out of five possessed degrees.[5] The first graduate to appear in the Elizabethan lists of All Hallows the Less was in 1588;[6] five of the six subsequent curates possessed degrees.[7]

Some of the perpetual curacies were by this time under parochial proprietorship, the incumbents being nominated by

---

1. Robert Gittins (St. Benet Sherehog 1595-7); Peter Fermyne (St. Clement Eastcheap 1595-1606); Ephraim Paget (St. Edmund Lombard St. 1601-c.1640); Ambrose Golding (St. Gregory 1591-1606); John Dod (St. Stephen Coleman St. 1597-1609).
2. Michael Gifford (St. Botolph Billingsgate 1597-1629) was a brother of the Puritan divine George Gifford whose patrons included the Earl of Essex. William Stepney (St. John Evangelist 1600-1608) was a well-known schoolmaster, and author of The Spanish schoolemaster (1591). John Clarke was coadjutor at St. Nicholas Cole Abbey for some time before his presentation
3. Supra, pp.49-51
4. Giles Sinclair (c.1563-1566).
5. William Scott (1589 ibm), John Oliver (1590), Gervase Walker (1591), Melchisadeck Francis (c.1594-1607).
6. Francis Byard (1588-9).
7. John Atkinson (1589), Robert Burton (1590), Mark Sedlington (1594-c.96), John Tanner (1596), Peter Sefton (1597-1603).

the vestry; the fact that citizens looked wherever possible for a preaching curate partly accounted for the increased number of graduates. More generally, the improvement was a symptom of the increased supply of university-trained clergy available in London, a supply that so outstripped the limited benefice market that well-qualified clergy were obliged to take up unbeneficed posts in the city, assistant curacies or minor clerical offices attached to public bodies.[1]

The London patrons were quick to exploit this potential. Aylmer, despite his ailing health and his yearning for rural retirement, did not abandon his earlier interest in the promotion of able and suitable ministers to City benefices.[2] Fletcher's period of episcopal office was too brief to leave a mark on this selection of incumbents,[3] but Bancroft carefully followed Aylmer's policy in his disposal of patronage;[4] the most outstanding of his protégés to hold a London living was perhaps Samuel Harsnet, later archbishop of York.[5] Among the

---

1. cf. Chapter IX.
2. James Smith, a 27 year old graduate, was preferred from the bishop's household to St. Alphage in 1593 (GLMS. 9535/2, f.60r.; Henn. 86). Aylmer's son, no mean scholar, was collated to the richest living in London in 1592 (Henn. 274). Robert Temple, a chaplain late in the bishop's life, held livings in plurality in the city (Henn. 144,249).
3. His few collations included Henry Caesar, described by Rowse as the first Anglo-Catholic (op.cit.336), and Peter Fermyne, who in 1606 was deprived for simony.
4. The strictly orthodox John Dix was made chaplain to Bancroft and given an additional London benefice. (GLMS. 9537/9, f.67r; Henn. 93,281).
5. St. Margaret New Fish St. (1599-1604). He was also chaplain to Bancroft.

lay patrons, the appointment of Egerton as Lord Keeper in 1596 proved beneficial; esteemed by contemporaries for his integrity in the disposal of the clerical patronage at his command,[1] he contrived to find worthy incumbents for the meanest of the London livings in the Crown gift. He successively presented the noted Downham brothers to the rectory of St. Margaret Lothbury,[2] one of them - George, later bishop of Derry -, apparently entirely on his own initiative;[3] at St. George Botolph Lane, a living so poor that traditionally it attracted only the most nondescript of ministers, Egerton was able to secure the nomination of James Meadowes, the only recipient of a doctor's degree in divinity at Basle University among all the Elizabethan incumbents of London.[4]

Some biographical illustrations may give an impression of the London clerical scene as moulded by the various influences described. Of the eighteen bishops or bishops-designates who served part of their clerical apprenticeship in London during

---

1. John Dove, dedicating A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1596), to Egerton wrote, "...Your integrite in bestowing spirituall livings, and making choyse of learned men upon whome you bestow them, hath satisfied the common expectation, and fully answered that great hope which the Cleargie of Englande hath conceived of you." (f.ir.)
2. Henn. 279.
3. No petitioner is named in the presentation lists (Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.8r.).
4. Alumni Oxon, 1,iii,998.

the reign,[1] no less than eleven were incumbents for a part or the whole of the last decade of the century;[2] among them were two future archbishops, Bancroft and Harsnet. Including Bancroft, three of them were to govern the diocese in which they now served as incumbents,[3] and were doubtless to find their pastoral experience invaluable in their later role. Late-Elizabethan London indeed formed a rich nursery for the early Jacobean episcopal bench, producing on the one hand able administrators such as Cotton and Barlow, and, on the other, model diocesan pastors of the calibre of Lancelot Andrewes and Nicholas Felton. Their professional and vocational achievement testify to the long-term success of archiepiscopal and episcopal methods of selecting, patronising, and promoting young men of distinction, orthodox in their religious views, to combat the challenge of Puritanism in the capital. Of the eleven future

---

1. Bancroft, Barlow, John Bullingham, Cotton, George Downham, Nicholas Kenman, Edgeworth, Felton, Fotherby, Harsnet , Horsfall Lancelot. Andrewes, John King, May, Ravis and John Young were all consecrated bishops; James Calfhill and James Proctor were nominated, but died before their consecration. Another incumben Coverdale, was an ex-bishop, while George Boleyn is traditionall believed to have refused one (DNB.)
2. Bancroft (St. Andrew Holborn 1584-97); Barlow (St. Dunstan East (1596-1606); Cotton (St. Margaret New Fish St. 1578-99); Bownham (St. Margaret Lothbury 1596-1601); Felton (St.Antholin 1592-1626); Fotherby (St. Mary le Bow 1594-6); Harsnet (St. Margaret New Fish St.(1599-1604); Andrewes (St. Giles Cripplegate 1588-1605); King (St. Andrew Holborn 1597-1611); Ravis (All Hallows Barking 1591-98); and Young (St. Magnus 1566-92).
3. Bancroft (1597-1604), Ravis (1607-9), and King (1611-21).

bishops in London livings during this decade, eight owed their early advancement to the patronage of Whitgift, Aylmer or Bancroft,[1] five being chaplains of the archbishop,[2] Nothing brings out in more striking fashion the importance of the archbishop's peculiars in the formation of a solid Anglican intellectual group in the capital.

Their stories provided classic illustrations of the pathway to a successful career in the church, but they were by no means the exclusive repositories of learning and academic distinction in contemporary London. There were, as has been seen, twelve doctors of divinity,[3] and eighteen bachelors of divinity among the seventy-two graduates in City benefices in 1601. The future bishops were generally, though not invariably, in possession of one or other degree;[4] others were held by men who received less exalted advancement up the lower rangs of the clerical ladder as archdeacons.[5] A few post-1550 incumbents

---

1. Barlow, Bancroft, Cotton, Andrewes, Felton, Fotherby, Harsnet, and Ravis. Of the remaining three, Young was originally a protégé of Grindal, while Downham and King owed much to Lord Keeper Egerton's favour.
2. Barlow, Andrewes, Bancroft, Fotherby, and probably Felton.
3. 10 other 1601 incumbents were later awarded D.D.s - Andrew Arnold, Childersey, Felton, Fenton, Harsnet, Lilley, Nuttall, Sanderson, Speight, and Tighe.
4. Exceptions included Andrewes and Harsnet.
5. William Hutchinson (Archdeacon of St. Albans 1581-c.1600; possibly Archdeacon of Cornwall 1603); Thomas Staller (Archd. of Rochester 1593-1606); Robert Tighe (Archd. of Middlesex c. 1595-1616); Thomas Sanderson (Archd. of Rochester 1606-1614).

achieved the highest academic distinctions as masters of colleges or even vice-chancellors of a university;[1] a much larger number were known primarily for their literary qualities. Authors of sermons preached at Paul's Cross and later printed, partly for propaganda purposes, at the request of the bishop, were not uncommon;[2] Thomas Sorocold was the author of a best-selling devotional work,[3] as, on a different level, was Lancelot Andrewes.[4] The first posthumous edition of any part of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity was brought out in 1604 by John Spenser, later president of Corpus Christi College Oxford, and vicar of St. Sepulchre in London since 1599.[5] John Dove and Roger Fenton were both commentators on controversial topical affairs, the one a specialist on divorce,[6] the other a foremost critic of usury and simony.[7] Stephen Gosson was an ex-dramatist of minor repute, whose sermons were redolent of the rhetoric of the stage.[8] More esoteric were the literary claims of William Bedwell, rector of St. Ethelburgh in 1601, and the "...father of Arabic studies in England",[9] and of

---

1. Andrewes (Mr. of Pembroke Coll. Cambridge); Felton (Mr. of Pembroke); Harsnet (Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge); King (Vice-Chancellor of Oxford); Spenser (President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.).
2. e.g. Bancroft, Dove, Gosson, William Gravett, Temple, Thomas White.
3. Supplications of saints, a booke of prayers (26th edn.by 164
4. Institutiones piae, or directi ns to pray (3rd. edn. 1640).
5. DNB.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. cf. The trumpet of warre (1598).
9. DNB.

John Willis, described as a stenographer and mnemonician, and author of The Art of Stenographie (1602), "...the first practical and rational scheme of modern shorthand founded on a strictly alphabetical basis".[1] An acknowledgement of the intellectual standing of the late Elizabethan London ministry came in 1604, when among the divines appointed to translate the Bible were seven City incumbents who had been preferred to their livings at various dates between 1588 and 1602.[2]

A comparison with other areas emphasises how exceptional was the standard of education among the beneficed clergy of London. Even in 1560 when the ministry was still recovering from the effects of two drastic purges within the space of six years, the proportion of graduates - slightly more than 47% of the total - compared favourably with the highest of known rural ratios, the 38% in Oxford diocese, recently described as an exceptional area on account of its university recruiting potential.[3] By 1601, the proportion in London had risen by more than a half to 75%; even more significant was the dwindling of non-graduates among the new admissions to a mere handful post-1590. The Puritan lamentation in 1586 of the eclipse of the sun (the Gospel) in London "...thorow the dimme Clowdes of

---

1. Ibid.
2. Tighe, Andrewes, Bedwell, Ravis, Barlow, Spenser, and Fenton (Records of the English Bible, ed. A.W.Pollard (Oxford 1911), 49-53).
3. Hill, 207, note 1.

Unlearned ministers, whereof there be no small number"[1], unjustified as it was when we know that in 1583 fifty-eight of the ninety-five City incumbents possessed degrees[2], was hardly assuaged by the character of the post-1589 improvement. In so far as a deliberate policy was possible, the increase was effected largely at the expense of the Puritans, for by planting chaplains and protégés of impeccable orthodoxy, and whose later episcopal or archdiaconal careers were evidence of their ability[3], the authorities were cutting off a principal source of Puritan strength. Not only were they removing those abuses whose existence the nonconformists condemned and yet thrived upon, but by installing men of the calibre of Lancelot Andrewes, Nicholas Felton, and William Barlow, they were providing concrete realisation of the potential of positive Anglicanism, an invaluable practical complement to Hooker's philosophical apologia.

(ii) THE NON-GRADUATE INCUMBENT

Whereas their degree gave a fairly consistent clue to the educational standards of the graduate clergy, no such

---

1. SP. ii,185.
2. More justification for the Puritan complaints was provided by the condition of the unbeneficed ministers in London (cf. Chapter IX).
3. According to Barlow's account, the 18 Anglican representatives at the Hampton Court conference included five who either held or had held London livings - Bancroft, Andrewes, Ravis, King, and Barlow himself. (E.Cardwell, A History of Conferences (Oxford 1841), 169).

comprehensive gauge is available for their non-graduate counterparts. Included in their ranks were men of all depths of learning, ranging from the university recruit who had taken the required course for a degree in arts without actually proceeding B.A., to the clerk, with no apparent qualifications beyond a state of literacy, who had slipped into an incumbency during the clerical shortage in the early years of the reign. Where the mean is impossible to ascertain, the first task must be to discuss the minimum educational qualifications necessary for admission into the ministry and entry to a benefice.

A candidate for ordination, bearing sufficient testimony of his virtuous conversation and crime-less past, could be admitted into the diaconate if, after examination, he was found "... learned in the Latin Tongue, and sufficiently instructed in Holy Scripture".[1] An account of his faith in Latin, "agreeable and consonant" to the thirty-nine articles of 1562, was stipulated by the canons of 1571 and articles of 1575, and finally confirmed in 1604.[2] The 1571 act[3] appeared somewhat at variance with the Elizabethan canons, debarring candidates from being made 'minister' unless they could render an account of their faith in Latin, according to the thirty-nine articles, or "...

---

1. Preface to Forms of Consecration and Ordination 3 and 5 Ed. VI (E. Gibson, Codex Iuris Ecclesiastici Anglicani (Oxford 1761), 146.
2. Card. Synod. i; 113,133,266.
3. An Act to refourme certayne Dysorders touching Ministers of the Churche (13 El.c.XII) (Statutes of the Realm,iv,547).

have the special gift and ability to be a Preacher".[1] Though this act has been interpreted by ecclesiastical lawyers to apply to priests rather than deacons,[2] the concession on the knowledge of Latin may well have been extended in practice to admission to the inferior order.

Ultimately, responsibility for the suitability of a candidate rested with the ordaining bishop and his examining chaplains;[3] standards inevitably fluctuated from diocese to diocese, according to the quality of a particular bishop and the demand for clergy in a particular area. Details of the actual examination are not available for London diocese, but in the early years of the reign, when the shortage of clergy was most acute, they probably differed little from those of Ely in 1560-61.[4] There, a candidate, after giving particulars of his background, was interrogated on the virtue and honesty of his conversations, his ability to read and write, his motives - whether he entered of "...a good zeal that he barythe towardes Gods worde" -, his Latin knowledge and conversation, and his study and understanding of the scriptures. Sixty-eight candidates submitted; two were respited and seven rejected outright.[5]

---

1. Gibson, op.cit. 146.
2. Burn, iii, 33.
3. For a discussion of medieval standards of examination, cf. H.S.Bennett, Medieval Ordination Lists in the English Episcopal Registers, Studies Presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, ed. J. Conway Davies (1957), 23-34, passim.
4. A. Gibbons, Ely Episcopal Records (Lincoln 1891), 4.
5. Including a B.A. and a fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.

While the London ordination records unfortunately do not record the proportion of failures, it is still possible to form some estimate of the thoroughness of the ordination examination. The mass ordinations of 1559-1560 in themselves suggest a lack of discrimination in the acceptance of candidates; of 167 deacons admitted by Grindal (or by another bishop on his behalf) between December 28th, 1559 and March 24th, 1561, only thirty-one held university degrees.[1] On three occasions, thirty-nine, thirty-five, and thirty deacons were admitted simultaneously;[2] on each occasion the archdeacon was the sole recorded assistant examiner. Archbishop Parker's letter to Grindal in August 1560[3] substantiated the suspicion of over-indulgent allowances on the part of the bishop; his instructions that henceforward Grindal be "...very circumspect in admitting any to the ministry, and only to allow such as having good testimony of their honest conversation, have been traded and exercised in learning, or at the least have spent their time with teaching of children", appear to have had an effect. The intake of deacons fell by a half in 1561,[4] and did not afterwards exceed a total of forty a year during Grindal's tenure of office in London.[5]

---

1. GLMS. 9535/1, ff.82r.-101v.
2. Ibid. ff.83r.,85r., 88v.
3. Correspondence of Matthew Parker, ed. J.Bruce, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1853), 120-1.
4. The total was 43 (GLMS. 9535/1,ff.101v.-107r.)
5. The highest was 39 in 1567 (ibid, ff.130r.-135r.)

The number of examining chaplains as well as the number of men simultaneously ordained, provide clues to the thoroughness or otherwise of the ordination examination. Canon law and statutory law were as variable on this point as on the necessity for a knowledge of Latin. The examination, both of deacons and priests, was in canon law a branch of the archdiaconal office.[1] Other priests, "skilled in the divine law, and exercised in the ecclesiastical sanctions," were also appointed to examine candidates for three days successively and finally present those who were approved, to the bishop.[2] In the 1604 Canons the responsibility was laid upon the bishop, who was to examine in the presence of those ministers assisting at the imposition of hands; if any 'lawful impediment' were known, the candidate was to be carefully examined by the said ministers.[3] While canon law made no precise requirements about the number of examining clergy, a statue of 21 Henry VIII dealing with pluralities, allowed every bishop six chaplains "...because he must occupy six chaplains at giving of orders and consecration of churches."[4]

In practice, none of the examination sessions lasted more than a day, and only Aylmer among the Elizabethan bishops appears to have actively participated in them.[5] The number of

---

1. Burn,iii,34.
2. Ibid.35.
3. Card. Synod,i,267 (No.XXXV).
4. Statutes of the Realm, iii,294 (21 H.VIII,c.13.).
5. According to Bennett (loc.cit.24), it was exceptional for a medieval bishop to examine in person.

examiners was as variable as the rules governing them. As we have seen, Grindal in his most prolific phase employed only one archdeacon for the purpose; post-1560, the number ordained by Grindal on the same day did not once reach double figures, and only very occasionally were the services of an extra examiner called upon.[1] Bishop Sandys' ordinations were few and far between; in his primary ceremony, when twenty-one candidates were made deacons, three archdeacons and the dean of St. Paul's had taken part in the preliminary examination.[2] Aylmer, far less conservatively-minded in this respect than his predecessor, appeared to be no less thorough in his examination of candidates.[3] Seventy-three deacons (forty-four non-graduates) were admitted in 1577,[4] - Sandys' neglect to ordain more than six deacons in a period of four years between 1572-6 must largely account for this number[5] -, - but all were in groups of under twenty; post-1577 the annual intake dropped sharply, ranging from thirteen in 1582 to a maximum of fifty-one in 1585.[6]

---

1. e.g. Archbishop Mullins and John Young, chaplain to Grindal both examined on one occasion in 1567 (GLMS. 9535/1, f.129v.).
2. The examiners were Dean Nowell and Archdeacons Mullins, Walker, and Watts (ibid. f.149v.).
3. cf. Strype, Aylmer, 21-2. "Another of his cares was for the sypplying the Church with Ministers, that might, be persons of learning and honesty, and bred in the Universities...".
4. GLMS. 9535/1, ff.152v.-160v.
5. Only 26 deacons, and 25 priests are recorded as being ordained in London during the whole of his 6 years' episcopate (ibid. ff.149v.-152r.)
6. GLMS. 9535/2, ff.1r.-65r.

In the first two years two chaplains generally formed the examination board;[1] they gradually increased in number as Aylmer enlarged his team of chaplains,[2] until in December 1579 there were six examiners, including Anthony Coranus, the learned Spanish preacher, to test the qualities of four diaconate and fourteen priestly candidates.[3] On March 30th,1580 there were no less than twelve examiners, including the bishop himself, of fifteen deacons.[4] This was unparalleled, but it was the exception rather than the rule to find less than four examining chaplains in the Ember ordinations sessions during Aylmer's later tenure of office. Aylmer's partiality for the maximum number of chaplains in his household service,[5] and the tendency for the examination to be held on the same day as the ordination service,[6] thus allowing the bishop to use the services of those clerics who were to assist in the imposition of hands on

---

1. e.g. William Lane and William Cotton May 15th,1577 (GLMS. 9535/1, f.152v.)
2. There were 3 examiners on April 15th,1579 when 22 deacons and 14 priests were admitted (Cotton, Archdeacon Squire, and Giles Lawrence, a D.C.L. (GLMS. 9535/2, f.5v.)
3. Ibid. f.9v. Four were chaplains (William Gravett, Cotton, John Leece, Richard Vaughan), the other was archdeacon of Middlesex (Squire). John Mullins, archdeacon of London, was a conspicuous absentee among Aylmer's ordination assistants.
4. Ibid. f.11r. They were Aylmer, Squire, Coranus, Cotton, Vaughan, John Keltridge, Leece, Thomas Crowe, John Dios, Henry Tripp, Henry Withers and Gravett.
5. The statute of 21 H. VIII c.13 allowed a bishop to hold 6 chaplains (Statutes,iii,294), but neither Grindal nor Sandys appear to have taken up the full complement.
6. This was an uncanonical practice of which neither Grindal nor Sandys had been guilty (Burn,iii,35).

ordination,[1] may in part have accounted for the existence of so many examiners; but all in all their numbers are a firm indication of Aylmer's concern with the quality of his ordinands. Two examining chaplains generally sufficed at the ordination services of Fletcher and Bancroft.[2]

While we are unable to say how many were denied admission to the ministry in London for lack of learning, we may infer from the moderate numbers simultaneously ordained post-1560 and the number of examiners, that candidates, at least during Aylmer's time, were reasonably well tested. A further opportunity for the rejection of unlearned men came in the examination prior to their admission to a benefice. The examination of "...the ability and sufficiency of the person presented belongs to the bishop, who is the ecclesiastical judge...and may and ought to refuse the person presented, if he be not idonea persona."[3] Despite Burn's claim that "...the most common and ordinary cause [of rejection] is want of learning,"[4] it appears to have been rare in Elizabethan practice, and only

---

1. Canon XXXI in 1604 ruled that the ordination of both deacon and priest be performed in the presence of archdeacon, dean of the cathedral and at least two prebendaries, or in their absence, before 4 other 'grave' persons, M.A.s and licenced public preachers. (Card. Synod,i,264-5). 6 chaplains were required according to the statute, of 21 H.VIII c.13 (Statutes iii,294.).
2. GLMS. 9535/2, f.67v., f.87r.
3. Burn,i,152. cf. 1575 and 1585 canons for the tightening of educational qualifications necessary for admission to a benefice. (Card. Synod.i,134,142.).
4. Burn,i,156.

one such case has been discovered in London diocese.[1] The reason doubtless lay with the remedies available for both patron and clerk for what they considered to be refusal without good cause. The clerk's remedy lay in the ecclesiastical courts, by way of a duplex querela,[2] the right to appeal to a higher court; more common was the patron's remedy, by quare impedit in the temporal court.[3] At a time when legal redress of this kind was involving bishops, who had refused the presentation of non-subscribing clerks, in litigation, they were not anxious to incur additional risks by rejections for lack of learning.[4]

Economic realities in the early years of the reign obliged the ecclesiastical authorities to accept sub-standard candidates for the ministry; much time and labour were spent in the next forty years devising courses of instruction that would improve the quality of those indicriminately admitted. The difficulties of refusing an unlearned man either orders or a benefice, and of removing him from his freehold incumbency on

---

1. John Gage, exhibited a presentation to the vicarage of Great Baddow in Essex before Grindal on November 18th,1566. Examined on the 5th Chapter of St. Paul to the Galations, he was found inadequate both on the grammar and the meaning, and the bishop rejected him as unsuitable to have the cure of the souls (LCCRO. Lib.VG.Huick, f.148v.). A.Tindal Hart, in his Unlearned and Ignorant Men, Church Quarterly Review, CLVII (1956),191, mentions one cleric being refused institution on account of ignorance in Lincoln in 1576.
2. Burn, 1,159.
3. Ibid. 163.
4. cf. Hill,55-6; cf. J.E.Neale, Elizabeth I And Her Parliaments, 1584-1601 (1957), 79.

account of his educational deficiencies, made such courses of instruction vital if the church was to withstand the attacks of its critics. A royal injunction of 1559 required every '...parson, vicar, curate, and stipendiary priest' under the degree of M.A. to have a copy of the New Testament, both in English and in Latin; they were to be examined by the bishops and other ordinaries in their synods and visitations, to show "...how they have profited in the study of holy scripture".[1] In practice, the responsibility for improving clerical learning along these lines was delegated to the archdeacon, a departure recognised and authorised in the Advertisements of 1565 which instructed archdeacons at their visitations to appoint curates "...to certaine textes of the Newe Testamente to bee conde without booke. And in theire nexte synode to exact a rehearsal of them".[2] All clerics were also required by these regulations to pledge themselves, inter alia, to the daily reading of at least one chapter in both the Old and the New Testaments "...with good advisement to thincrease of my knowledge," before they were admitted to any ecclesiastical offide.[3] The articles in the Advertisements were confirmed

---

1. A Collection of Articles, compiled by A.Sparrow (1684), 72.
2. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 328.
3. Ibid. 331.

and given greater authority by the 1571 canons which in addition made the exercises obligatory for graduates under the rank of M.A. as well as non-graduates.[1]

A letter from Archdeacon Mullins to his bishop in July, 1576, gives a valuable picture of the instructional system in force at that time under the operative authority of the 1571 canons.[2] Mullins, replying to episcopal enquiries about the number, type, and procedure of exercises for the improvement of clerical learning, described the course of study followed at bi-annual meetings of the ministers. All non-preaching clergy were beforehand given four or five chapters of the New Testament "...to reade and studie...diligentlie till the halfe yeare come up". On the appointed date the non-preachers were called together to a specified church, and queried "...of sutch places as seme to have anie hardnes. And thei answer according to ther skill"; where answers were unsatisfactory, the archdeacon himself expounded upon "...the meaning of that place." The exercise lasted for four or five days continuing until all the relevant chapters had been discussed, and was then adjourned for six months, more chapters being appointed for study in the meantime. Progress was evidently fairly steady, for since the collation of Mullins to the archdeaconry

---

1. Card. Synod, i,117.
2. Addit. MS. 29546, f.54v.

in 1561 the whole of the New Testament had been covered, and the group were now studying the Apocalypse.

The order of the exercise, it appears, conformed to the regulations laid down in the Advertisements and in 1571, but its composition was somewhat different; while all sub-masters of arts were required by the canon to attend, only non-preachers in fact did so. As it was possible for non-graduates to hold preaching licences, and for graduates to be non-preachers, this departure could to some degree change the character of the participants, affording an opportunity for men of little learning but who had managed to obtain a preaching licence, to avoid the exercises. The contemporary respect for the preacher is well brought out by this archdiaconal modification of canonical regulation.

No important extension of the study-course was officially devised before 1585. This was largely due to Grindal's preoccupation with the prophesying experiment that was already in existence, in some areas, in the early years of his primacy, and his later sequestration for defying the Queen over this matter. Prophesyings, essentially local growths, and flourishing most in rural areas within easy accessibility to central towns, were already encouraged by a few bishops before Grindal gave them archiepiscopal sanction.[1] They were a "...

---

1. M.M.Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago 1939),253. Their ancestry "...can be readily traced back to the conference of the Continental Reformed system as reflected in à Lasco's orders for his London church and Hooper's quarterly gatherings in his diocese."

combination of public forum and literary society to which the ministers of the town and countryside devoted each Saturday morning from nine to eleven".[1] Each clergyman expounded on a given text, and was then followed by colleagues who appraised his exposition; learned ministers passed their judgement, questions were asked by the audience, but not, in Northampton at least, by the laymen allowed to be present.[2] Meetings were presided over by moderators. The carefully-prepared discourses, the freedom of criticism, and the participation of the most learned ministers were all conducive to improving the quality of the unlearned, and the minds of the lay onlookers, but the links between prophesyings and known Puritan areas and personnel, and the lack of official ecclesiastical control over their activities made them intrinsically suspect to the Queen who was prepared to sacrifice her archbishop in order to suppress them. London, however, was not directly involved in this controversy, for, according to Mullins' letter of 1576, "As for propheciyng, there is none in this archdeaconrie of London."[3] Doubtless the ease with which ministers anxious to improve their learning, could assemble privately in the city, the smaller proportion of ignorant ministers in incumbencies, and the relatively small Puritan element among the beneficed clergy,

---

1. Ibid, 255.
2. Ibid, 255. cf. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 389-91 for directions made for a similar exercise in Chester diocese in 1574.
3. Addit. MS. 29546, f.54v.

all account for the passive part played by the capital in this experiment.

Clerical study-courses developed in a somewhat haphazard fashion on a diocesan level between 1576-1583 as a result of Grindal's incapacitation. Bishop Cooper's 1577 instructions to the inferior clergy of Lincoln to make a weekly study of Bullinger's sermons in his Decades preparatory for examination in the archdeacon's visitation by the ordinary, and the most learned ministers in the area, contained elements that anticipated the convocation orders of 1586.[1] In 1577, Barnes ordered the holding of two regular chapters annually in each deanery of the diocese of Durham, at which the clergy of the deanery should be examined of their progress in learning and studying the scriptures;[2] the organisation of these meetings along decanal rather than archdiaconal lines appeared to be a novel feature.[3] Details are not available for the archdeaconry of London at this time, but the manner of the exercises held in St. Alban's archdeaconry, within the same diocese, suggest that Aylmer in the early years of his episcopate had not departed substantially from the policy of his predecessor. In 1581

---

1. W.P.M.Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, Alcuin Club Collections XXV (1924),1,c
2. Ibid, c-ci.
3. For the interest taken by reformed thinkers in a revival of rural decanal chapters, cf. P.Collinson, The Puritan Classical Movement in The Reign of Elizabeth I (Ph.D. London,1957), 232-40.

the non-preachers of St. Albans were instructed at the visitation to study scriptural passages for examination without notes at the following synod, a course very similar to that described by Mullins for the London archdeaconry in 1576.[1] In 1582, new measures were introduced in St. Albans,[2] but it is not known whether they were initiated by Aylmer for the whole diocese, or by the archdeacon for his own jurisdiction alone. Non-preachers and those under the rank of M.A., were required to give monthly written evidence of their scriptural studies to a neighbouring clergyman who was a B.A., or M.A., or held a preaching licence. The scripts were to be delivered by the examiner to the Official at the end of each quarter "...that it may appeare how they have profyted in their studies."

Whitgift's accession, Parliamentary agitation for a learned ministry,[3] royal complaints about clerical ignorance[4] and the need for a replacement of the condemned prophesyings, all accounted for the spate of regulations introduced to improve the quality of the inferior clergy between 1584 and 1587. Two important sets of orders were drawn up in the convocation of

---

1. Herts. Rec. Office, Acta Bks. of St. Alban's Archdeacon's Court (ASA. 9, f.282v)
2. A Calendar of Papers, Records of the Old Archdeaconry of St. Alban's, ed. H.R.Wilton Hall, St. Albans and Herts, Architectural and Archaeological Soc. (1908), 21. They are included in a letter from the Official of the court to an apparitor, dated April 30th, 1582.
3. Neale, op.cit. 63-71.
4. Ibid. 70-1,163.

1584, one dealing with qualifications necessary before entry to the ministry,[1] the other being concerned with the increase of learning in the "...unlearned sort of ministers".[2] Weekly study of a chapter in the Old and New Testament, with summaries of their content in Latin, was laid down for all who were neither M.A.s nor licensed preachers; quarterly examination tests of "...a common place of divinity" were to be organised by the ordinary, and answered in Latin. Those lacking a knowledge of Latin, could answer in English, but could be proceeded against if "...in convenient time ... (having regard to their age and capacities)", they failed to improve their Latin. Every quarter they were to be examined by the archdeacons or a learned preacher at synods and visitations.

The regulations, borrowing heavily from systems already in existence, reflected a somewhat conservative approach in the emphasis laid upon a Latin grounding. More novel was the item that, apparently for the first time, sanctioned quarterly rather than bi-annual clerical gatherings. Although Cardwell doubted whether the orders were adopted generally,[3] they appear to have been set up almost immediately in London diocese. Aylmer wrote to his archdeacons in April 1585, reciting the

---

1. Card. Synod.i,138-146.
2. Card. Doc. Annals,ii,21-2; These orders were confirmed by the Queen on March 31st. 1585 (Strype, Whitgift,i,400).
3. Card. Doc. Annals,ii,21, note

archiepiscopal instructions, and demanding quarterly returns of clerics "...notoriously negligent or wilfully disobedient to the Orders concerning the Exercises."[1]

The St. Alban's records shed interesting light on the actual practice under the new regulations.[2] Non-preachers were divided at the visitation into three groups according to their aptitudes; each group was allowed three months to complete certain studies. Four were ordered "...to collecte out of all the Chapters of the Epistle to the Romayns such notable sentences as doe appeare unto their Judgement fitt either to confirme some principle of Religion or to refute an errour or to teache some thing towching life and maners to be followed or to be avoided. And the said use of every such sentence they shall sett downe in wryting together with the sentence next and imediatly followeing the same sentence. And the said select sentences only they shall learne without the booke or by harte against the tyme that they doe deliver up their said collections."

Another four ministers were given an additional exercise "...upon a principle of Religion viz. this by the right Receaving of the sacrament of the L: Supper the faithfull are

---

1. Cal. of St. Alban's P pers, 45. (April 30th 1585). Aylmer's instructions resulted from a letter sent by the archbishop to him on April 16th, 1585.
2. Herts. R.O.Acta Bk., A.S.A. 9, f.124v.

made one with christe." Finally, one Haylock was required to do both the first exercise, and to write upon "...this Theme in latten, Spiritus est christi vicarius in terris". All were threatened with suspension if negligent.

Despite threats of ecclesiastical censure, the inferior clergy in London at least, showed considerable indifference towards schemes for their self-improvement. By late 1585, the records of the diocesan consistory court began to reflect this apathy.[1] A number of London ministers, presumably complained of by the archdeacon, and cited to the Consistory according to Aylmer's instructions, appeared before the vicar general in November.[2] Most of them were ordered to attend upon the archdeacon at his next court day, and bring back a certificate under his hand of their appointed exercises;[3] one or two curates were inhibited from their ecclesiastical functions until they had done so.[4] Successful exemption claims were made by some,

---

1. LCCRO. Lib.Corr.1583-6,xvi. The previous volume (covering February 1585-August 1585 is missing, but the absence of any entries concerning the exercises in Lib.xvi between August-November 1585 suggests that there were no proceedings against defaulters before the latter date.
2. Their first appearances occurred on November 4th (ibid.ff.11 12v.) probably following their non-attendance at the Michaelmas exercise. Most of them were assistant curates, but John Johnson (f.11v.), James Taylor (F.11v.), William Hall (f.12r.), Henry Fletcher (f.12r.), and Hugh Andrewes (f.12v.) were all beneficed
3. e.g. Hugh Andrewes; ordered to attend at the archdeacon's court and to bring a certificate into the consistory court of th exercises he had been assigned to perform. (ibid, f.12v.).
4. Henry Fletcher, P C. of St. James Clerkenwell, was one of them. His inhibition was relaxed two days later on his bringing a certificate of the exercise assigned to him (ibid. f.13r.)

wrongfully cited under the 1585 regulations, as they held M.A. degrees or preaching licences.[1] Others less successfully pleaded as their excuse illness,[2] shortage of time,[3] funeral engagements[4] or, in the case of George Turner, rector of St. Mildred Poultry "...senectutem et infirmitatem colici ita ut non potest scribere exercitum suum."[5] Only John Scarlet, rector of St. Bartholomew Exchange, however, presented a powerful enough case to secure a temporary exemption, on the ground that "...he had intertayned into his house a bachelor of dyviniti to read the testament and psalmes in Greeke to him of purpose to labor to be admitted to preache...".[6] The vicar general bowed to such zeal, and was ready, if the archdeacon agreed, "...in respect of his age and that he hath byn a student in Trinitie Colledge,"[7] to give him a year's leave from the exercise so long as he certified quarterly to the archdeacon of his progress in his studies.

---

1. e.g. James Stopes was exempted on producing his preaching licence (ibid. f.14v.), Thomas Johnson on testifying to his M.A. title (f.15v.).
2. John Lisby (ibid. f.41v.).
3. John Norris, curate of Christ Church, claimed he had attended for one day, and could not spare any more time (ibid. f.17r.).
4. John Payne, curate of St. Alban's Wood St., said he was present at all exercises "...save one when he was hindred by a funerall". (Ibid. f.38v.).
5. Ibid. f.39r. He was told to certify whether the archdeacon accepted the excuse.
6. Ibid. Lib. xviii,f.12r. He is wrongly named Francis Scarlet in the court book.
7. He was about 54 years of age. Venn identifies him as a pensioner of St. John's, and probably a B.A. in 1561 (Alumni Cantab. i,iv,29).

The preoccupation of the London consistory court with cases of clerical negligence in their studies during the winter and summer of 1585-86 may have been symptomatic of a similar state of affairs elsewhere; doubtless it was partly responsible for a new set of orders in 1586, more comprehensive than its predecessors and containing facets that flavoured somewhat of aspects of the suppressed prophesyings. These orders were introduced by the archbishop into Convocation on December 2nd, 1586,[1] but it is clear that they had been issued to the bishops under archiepiscopal authority some months earlier; in London diocese, Aylmer took advantage of the general episcopal visitation of July-August 1586 to put them into action.[2] As with earlier regulations, the 'inferior ministers' affected were those who held neither the degree of M.A. nor a preaching licence.[3] Daily study and note-taking of a chapter in the Bible, and weekly reading of a sermon in Bullinger's Decades were insisted upon. Their literary labours were to be examined quarterly by a group of six or seven preachers assigned by the ordinary for that purpose, who were to certify annually to archdeacon or bishop of their pupils' progress. Negligence on the part of the inferior ministers was threatened with ecclesiastical censure, including the inhibition of curates from

---

1. Card. Synod. ii,562-4.
2. The date at which these orders were first circulated by the archbishop is not known.
3. Holders of a degree in civil law were also exempt.

their charges.

The most interesting departure from precedent was the transference of examining responsibility from the exclusive charge of the archdeacon or his substitutes at quarterly exercises of the clergy, to groups of "...grave and learned preachers, who shall privately examine the diligence and view the notes of the said ministers." The establishment of a number of preachers to appraise the efforts of less-gifted colleagues was reminiscent of the practice at the prophesyings, but the method of appointment and the manner of examination makes a closer analogy unrealistic. Aylmer announced the names of what he called his commissioners, and the times of examination, as he passed through the various deaneries of the diocese during his visitation. Three groups of examiners were appointed for the archdeaconry of London, one of seven men to deal with twelve ministers, another of five to deal with eight, and the third of three to examine even inferior clerics.[1] The examiners were all beneficed clergy within the City,[2] several of

---

1. GLMS. 9537/6, ff.108r., 115r., 122r.
2. George Dickens (R. of St. Alban's Wood St.), Thomas White (V. of St. Dunstant West), John King (R. of St. Anne and St. Agnes), Robert Clay (R. of St. Leonard Foster Lane), Thomas Crowe (R. of St. James Garlickhythe), Richard Turnull (P C. of St. Mary Colechurch), William Gravett (V. of St. Sepulchre), William Arhbold (R. of St. Peter Cornhill), Richard Wood (V. of All Hallows Barking), Thomas Staller (R. of St. Mary Hill), Richard Judson (R. of St. Peter le Poer), Meredith Hanmer (V. of St. Leonard Shoreditch), Josua Gilpin (R. of St. Vedast), Thomas Duffield (R. of St. Thomas Apostle), and Henry Tripp (R. of St. Stephen Walbrook). Clay was the only non-graduate among them; he of course held a preaching licence.

them being also chaplains to Aylmer or Whitgift.[1] Their religious orthodoxy was therefore unimpeachable;[2] indeed, the omission of prominent preachers of equal intellectual status, but possibly suspect in their conformability, from the ranks of the examiners,[3] show how Aylmer made orthodoxy a prime qualification for his London appointments.

Advantage was taken of the visitation to pick out the clergy liable for these exercises, and to warn them to attend at the required time. It was also originally proposed to call upon all the clergy of each area - "...being either preachers or masters of arte" - to act as assistants to the commissioners "...in their appositions and exercises", but the summons was annulled,[4] possibly after a closer reading of the archiepiscopal orders had made it clear that the exercises were not intended to be general conferences of the clergy. Within three months the first exercises had taken place, and certificates of the results had been drawn up for archdiaconal and episcopal inspection.[5] Details, with examiners' comments ranging from

---

1. Dickens, Crowe, Gravett, and Tripp were all Aylmer's chaplains. Turnbull, Ashbold, Wood, Staller and Judson are known to have held chaplaincies with the archbishop.
2. A mild exception was Thomas White (SP.,i,221).
3. e.g. Arthur Bright, Robert Crowley.
4. Deleted copies of the order are in the Liber Visitationis (GLMS. 9537/6, [back of vol.]). In its place was substituted the order that if any of the commissioners were unable to attend, the archdeacon or, in his absence, the other commissioners, was to appoint a deputy.
5. Cal. St. Alban's Papers, 48-9.

"...a man of good hope" to "...w ake and unhable yett willing", survive for all the diocese apart from the archdeaconry of London.[1]

The unpopularity of these exercises, as of their predecessors, among the inferior clergy is manifest from the ingenious efforts made to avoid them. But Aylmer, with his extremely practical approach towards diocesan administration, was a difficult man to out-manoeuvre. Shortly after the episcopal visitation the vicar-general, writing to the archdeacons on the problem of attendance,[2] recalled how

> "...experience hath already taught some of you that amongst the "unsufficienter sort of them, some will procure such exercises as shall be appointed them to be made by others, while themselves be wholly bent upon idleness. I hope that you will see that every one shall be laboured withal to see whether those fruits he shall bring be of his own gathering or no".

The results of the first exercises, held in the autumn of 1586, disclosed another evasive technique which was not long in

---

1. They are inserted in the b ck of the 1586 Lib. Vis. (GLMS. 9537/6, [back of vol.]) Certificates from the examiners of "the unlearned sort" of St. Alban's archdeaconry are printed in the Cal. of St. Alban's Papers, 52-3.
2. Ibid. 48-9. The Calender gives the sender as the Doctors' Commons, which in fact was the address. The address and the authoritative tone of the letter strongly suggests that its author was the vic r general.

coming to Aylmer's notice. His lett r in December to Richard Vaughan, one of his chaplains and vicar of Great Dunmow in Essex,[1] brings out both his shrewdness and his perseverance in the task of improving ministerial standards and thus strengthening Anglican foundations. "...we are nowe credibly enformed,"[2] he wrote, "that dyvers of the saide unlearneder sorte of the ministery have studied and compassed sondry waies howe to avoide attendance and examinacion att those exercises, some by obteyninge licenses to preache; and yett doe nott preache att all or verie seldome, and others by contenewinge still willfullie ignorante without regarde by studye or labor to encrease their knowledge, others allso contemptuouslye absentinge themselves alltogither".

"To meete with whiche Inconveniences," he authorised his chaplain to summon all non-preachers under the rank of M.A. and all licensed preachers who seldom exercised their function, in the deaneries of which Vaughan was a commissioner, for verbal examination and literary ap osition. Those neglectful or contemptuous were to be certified to Aylmer for proceedings towards their "...absolute deprivacion by Lawe," if beneficed,

---

1. Vaughan was one of the examiners for the deaneries of Harling Dunmow, Hemingham and Braughing. (GLMS. 9537/6 [back of vol.]).
2. Aylmer to Vaughan, December 22nd.,1586. (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope 1,ff.131v.-132r.) The number of preaching licences issued by the vicar-general rose from 11 (1584), 19 (1585), to 24 (1586).

or removal, if curates. Licensed preachers were to be instructed to preach "...att the leaste everye seconde Sondaye", and certify Vaughan of their so doing, or lose their licences.[1] The threat of deprivation, of tenuous legality before Convocation gave authority to Whitgift's orders several months after they had been adopted in practice,[2] hinted of a ruthlessness typical of the bureaucrat's impatience with administrative inefficiency.

Whitgift's orders remained until the end of the reign the standard injunctions concerning the education of the inferior clergy.[3] Before each of the last four Parliaments of the reign, the archbishop, "...not insensitive to those defects in church life which lent substance to propaganda,"[4] sent circular letters to his bishops demanding certificates of the quality of those admitted to benefices since 1584, that he might find out how far the orders of 1587 and the canons of 1584 had been observed.[5] In 1587, the petit-canons of Rochester Cathedral were questioned as to their possession of a Bible in English and in Latin, and as to their daily conferring the same.[6] In the same

---

1. Ibid, f.132r.
2. Convocation was dissolved on March 24th,1587 and the orders presumably came into force immediately afterwards. (Card.Synod.ii 562). Aylmer, writing to Vaughan three weeks after the orders were introduced into Convocation on December 22nd.,1586, reassured him that "...your travayle wilbe more eased", when the orders were published. (LCCRO.Lib. VG.Stanhope,i,f.132r.).
3. P.M.Dawley, John Whitgift and the Reformation (1955), 201.
4. Neale, op.cit.217.
5. Ibid. An abstract of the letter sent by Whitgift to Aylmer on November 5th,1588, is printed in the Cal. of St. Alban's Papers, 66.
6. Kennedy, op.cit.i, ci.

year, Mullins ordered all the inferior clergy of London archdeaconry to possess Bible, Decades, and paper notebook, to write the capita or summa every week, "...the examinants to use these regiments with favour."[1] In 1590, Piers categorically enforced the orders in the parishes of the province of York.[2]

Actual performance is more difficult to estimate; much depended on the co-operation of the examining clergy, and the ability of the ordinary to enforce the inferior clergy to attend at the appositions and to complete the literary exercises. In London, Aylmer had reduced the possibilities of evasion by his exposure of the traffick in preaching licences, and of exercises being written by 'shadows'. Effective incentives and censures were both needed to secure good performance. The inducement in London, though not mentioned in the archbishop's orders, was the prospect of a preaching licence that would exempt the holder from further labours. These were obtainable following satisfactory reports from the examiners. Five ministers in St. Alban's archdeaconry progressed so favourably that within two years they were allowed to preach in their own parishes; others

---

1. Ibid, ci. Mullins' articles were issued on January 3rd,1587, several weeks before Convocation was dissolved. This explains the endorsement of one copy of the articles that they were "... not established by Convocation, but thought convenient to put in execution by ordinary authority and till further order shall be provided by the authority of her Majesty and the Synod." (Kennedy, op.cit. iii,239).
2. Ibid. i,ci.

"...have profited so far as may be judged by the Exercises, although not yet fit to preach".[1] Thomas Earl, rector of St. Mildred Bread Street, was in 1587 deemed worthy of a licence after attending various exercises for his edification for almost thirty years.[2]

No less an inducement was the active possibility of disciplinary measures against the negligent. In 1588, only two failed to perform their exercises in St. Alban's archdeaconry; both were suspended, and "...it is hoped that hereafter they will not be so slack."[3] An even more serious fate befell John Lisby, the non-graduate rector of St. Margaret Pattens in the City "...in non frequentando et perimplendo quidam exercita pro meliori informatione et eruditione cleri..."[4] After being in vain admonished to attend, he was suspended, the sentence being announced by Aylmer on December 13th, 1588.[5] Six months later, still persistent in his refusal to attend or to perform

---

1. Cal. of St. Alban's Papers, 68. (a draft reply from archdeacon to bishop concerning Whitgift's enquiries about the application of 1584 canons and 1587 articles.)
2. CUL. MS.Mm. 1,29, f.52r. Another to receive a licence in 1586 after a year's study was Christopher Tappam, who in 1598 was described as a M.A. (GLMS. 9537/9, [no fol.]). Earl made such progress that in 1589 at the age of 70, he was among the clergymen appointed to confer with the imprisoned Brownists. (Mm. I, 29,f.44v.)
3. Cal. of St. Alban's Papers, 68.
4. LCCRO. Lib. VG.Stanhope, 1,f.249r.
5. Ibid, f.249r.

his exercises, he was excommunicated.[1] Unrepentant to the end, Lisby appears to have abandoned his living following his sentence, and his neglect of the cure was made the grounds for the sequestration of the fruits of the benefice in February, 1590.[2] Lisby's circumstances were exceptional,[3] and his fate was unique among the London clergy post-1586, but it serves to bring out the ruthlessness with which Aylmer and his vicar-general, Stanhope, pursued their efforts to improve the standards of the inferior clergy by compulsory instructional courses.

It remains to particularise, as far as it is possible, on the actual quality of the non-graduate incumbents of London. The following table gives their distribution at various dates in the reign, and the incidence of 'scholars'[4] among them. A man who had spent some years in a university without taking a degree,- either through financial hardship or personal disinclination -, was not necessarily inferior in learning to

---

1. Ibid. f.325r. He had been previously excommunicated in February 1586 for contumacy, in not appearing to answer for his negligence in attending the exercises under the 1585 regulations. He later pleaded illness (LCCRO. Lib. Corr 1583-6, xvi, f.39r.,f.41v.)
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG.Stanhope, i, f.325r.
3. He was a local boy who had obtained the living through the influence of the parishioners, among them a namesake.
4. i.e. those who matriculated but did not take a degree, a frequent occurrence in this period. F.Caspari, in his Umanism and the Social Order in Tudor England (1954), 152, suggested that the practice indicated desire not to be considered a professional scholar.

his graduate counterparts, and at le st deserves to be separated from those who had no experience at all of a university.

DATE	TOTAL OF INCUMBENTS	DETAILS NOT KNOWN[1]	NON-GRADUATES	SCOLARS OF A UNIVERSITY[4]
1560	94	7	43	-
1566	102	15	45	1
1571	103	14	44	1
1577	97	5	37	3
1583	95	3	34	5
1589	95	1	36	4
1595	96	-	27	4
1601	96	1	23	2

Reasons for the steady decline of non-graduates post-1570 are discussed elsewhere.[2] Only for 1561 do official certificate giving details of the state of clerical learning survive,[3] and they are principally concerned with ministerial knowledge of Latin. Of fifty non-graduates, four were classed as doctus and two mediocriter doctus, eight knew Latin adequately, twenty-three understood a little, five did not understand it at all

---

1. Unknown either because their names do not survive, or because of the difficulty of identifying them in the university lists.
2. Supra, pp. 96 103
3. Mullins, 269-285.

(though one, the vicar of St. Bartholomew Hospital, posed as a scholar), and four were characterised as indoctus.[1] Particulars for the remaining four were omitted.

Knowledge of Latin, however, was becoming outmoded as an exclusive criterion of learning, in the Elizabethan period; more relevant to contemporary conditions was a close familiarity with the scriptures. Many of the non-graduate incumbents in Grindalian London were, as we have seen, men of poor birth who had slipped into the ministry in the first few years of the reign. Yet the poorest qualified was literate enough to read the homilies, a compulsory duty for all non-preachers, even if the quality of their reading was not always irreproachable.[2] The information available from clerical wills, fragmentary as it is, certainly teaches us to eschew a general condemnation of the quality of non-graduates in the 1560s; the extent of their private libraries is sometimes astonishing. Most spectacular was that of William Woodley, perpetual curate of St. Lawrence Fountney for a short time before his death in 1581.[3] Of no known university, his bibliographical collection suggested a humanist sensibility that had given much study to reformist

---

1. Ibid. 231.
2. cf. contemporary injunctions and visitation articles on this point e.g. 1559 Injunctions (No.liii) (Card. Doc. Annals, i, 231).
3. LCCRO. Consistory Ct. Bullock, f.47r. He was dead before the 1561 returns were made, but a more limited certificate of 1560 described him as 'interpretating' i.e. expounding certain scriptural themes in his own parish only (Mullins, 257).

doctrine before accepting its tenets. It was natural to find both "Erasmus"[1] and "Geneva Bible"[2] among the books named in his will. His Latin authors included Virgil, Horace, Plutarch, [redacted] and Cicero. His "Thesaurus lingue Latine" and "Eliotts Dictionaries with Howletts" were doubtless of great aid to his literary exercises. Among reformed theological matter were to be found Musculus' work on the psalter, "Mr. Hoopers booke upon the commandements"[3], and "my booke written with epistles orations and verses," presumably a common-place book.

Other wills are no less rewarding. Thomas Watson, probably perpetual curate of All Hallows Less from 1562 until his premature death in 1564 at the age of twenty-eight,[4] could pay for funeral sermons only by legacies to a colleague of his copy of Bullinger's work on the New Testament and "...my bible, agreeing to the great concordance."[5] William Aylward, an ex-religious who became rector of St. Anne and St. Agnes in 1561, included among his legacies on his death in 1575[6] copies of Peter Martyr's Commentaries upon the Judges, the Common Places

---

1. Probably the Paraphrase upon the New Testament, a copy of which was required in all parishes by the 1559 Injunctions. (Card. Doc. Annals, 1,214).
2. Printed in 1560. Woodley must have been among the earliest purchasers.
3. A declaration of the ten holy comaundementes (1548). (STC. has 5 editions by 1550).
4. Ordained priest April 25th, 1562 (GLMS. 9535/1, f.108r.).
5. LCCRO. Consistory Ct. Bullock, f.58v. The 'Great Bible' first came out in 1540. Its use was compulsory in all parish churches.
6. LCCRO. Cons.Ct., Bullock, f.215v.

of Musculus, 'Beacon's postell'[1] and "...my great old written booke of homilies." John Bendall, perhaps the Frankfurt refugee of that name in 1554,[2] and later a London parson, mentioned Tyndale's Testament in his will.[3] Richard Wilmot, one of Grindal's non-graduate ordinands of 1560,[4] and perpetual curate of St. Benet Finck for more than twenty years, possessed copies of Calvin's Institutes and Martyr's Commentaries on the Romans when he made his will in 1582.[5]

This source of information became more meagre as the ranks of married clergy increased, and property was left en bloc to wife and family. Voluntary accumulation of works in classics and theology,-with occasional aid from parish funds[6] - , on the scale practised by many of the least academically equipped incumbents in early Elizabethan London, strongly evokes the enthusiasm of the Elizabethan religious pioneers for the better comprehension of their cause. As the reign progressed, enthusiasm waned; the weakening of the initial momentum of reform is reflected in the difficulties confronting the diocesan authorities in enforcing the attendance of the inferior clergy at the quarterly instructional exercises.

---

1. Presumably Thomas Beacon's A new postil, conteinyng sermons upon all the Sondaye gospelles (1566).
2. Christine H. Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge 1938),86.
3. LCCRO. Cons. Ct., Bullock, f.153r.
4. GLMS. 9535/1, f.88v.
5. LCCRO. Cons. Ct., Bullock, f.329v.
6. cf. GLMS. 4352/1, f.20v.

Only the steady decline in the proportion of non-graduates post-1571 served to balance the pervasion of a growing professional outlook among the inevitably more sceptical ranks of second-generation Elizabethan clerics.[1]

By 1586, when Whitgift's comprehensive orders came into force, the educational standards of the London beneficed clergy had so improved that only twelve incumbents - seven rectors,[2] two vicars,[3] and three perpetual curates[4] - within the ninety-three parishes subject to episcopal jurisdiction were summoned to the exercises;[5] other graduates under the title of M.A. and non-graduates were exempted by reason of the preaching licences they held. The only graduate among the thirteen was Henry Fletcher, a B.A. but no preacher.[6] At least seven were

---

1. As early as 1566 a Paul's Cross preacher noted the waning of enthusiasm - "Oh what a nomber in the begynninge of this Quens days wear ther, that by ther speakinge went about to put the dume and deaffe to flight, but now he is become an indifferent and formall devell, he begynneth to sope them that courst him before, he biuldeth up the walls of Jericho agayn" (William Pady, Sept.1st.1566, Bodl. MS.Tanner, 50,10,f.81r.).
2. Hugh Andrewes (R. of St. John Zachary), George Turner (R. of Milared Poultry), James Taylor (R. of St. Andrew Hubbard), Francis Roberts (R. of St. George Botolph Lane), Giles More (R. of St. Katherine Coleman), John Lisby (R. of St. Margaret Pattens), and Thomas Earl (R. of St. Mildred Bread St.).
3. William Davies (V. of St. Olave Jewry), and William Hall (V. of St. Barts, Hospital).
4. Robert Heaz (P C. of St. Botolph Aldgate), Henry Fletcher (P C. of St. James Clerkenwell), and Christopher Cowse (P C. of St. Katherine Cree).
5. 14 assistant curates were summoned also (GLMS. 9537/6, ff. 108r-125r. passim).
6. Thomas Jenkinson, also a non-preaching B.A., managed somehow to avoid the summons.

ordinands of the pre-1570 period,[1] some of them ripely mature in age by this time.[2] Details concerning the others are not known.[3] In the main, they represented the dwindling remnants of a clerical class who had entered the ministry at a time when the possession of a degree or a preaching licence was not yet accepted as an exclusive set of values.

Perhaps the most appropriate epilogue to so elusive an enquiry as the state of learning of a man who possessed no formal qualifications, is provided by the testimony of Walter Tempest, the 'ignorant' curate of St. Giles Cripplegate in 1563.[4] Reproved by the archbishop's chaplains for his inferior skill, his reply, while confessing his inadequacy, revealed a sense of responsibility for the spiritual welfare of his parishioners that holders of the most distinguished degree could well have taken as their model.

"I am Curet over three Thousand and more of Gods Sheepe, and therefore my Function is not to Sleape, and be Sluggish, but to waite on my office to Discharge as I am charged in Teaching and Governing and to exercise myselfe to doe my Duty if I were worthy before the Lord..."

---

1. Davies, Fletcher, Tayor, More, Lisby, Earl, and Heax.
2. e.g. Andrewes (60), Earl (67), Hall (49.).
3. Cowse was possibly a post-1575 ordinand.
4. Egerton MS. 2350, f.67r.; printed in Strype, Parker, iii, 58-9, where misdated to 1569.

CHAPTER FOUR

PREACHERS AND PREACHING.

"Let them ever kepe the prechynges rather than the masse," declared the monk of Syon in 1530;[1] little could he have realised how soon his wish was to be fulfilled. In the most celebrated apologia for preaching in the Elizabethan period, Grindal, quoting St. Paul, called it the "...ministry of reconciliation of man unto God."[2] "By preaching of God's word," he told the Queen, "the glory of God is enlarged, faith is nourished, and charity is encreased. By it the ignorant is instructed, the negligent exhorted and incited, the stubborn rebuked, the weak conscience comforted,...the word of God worketh his effect by preaching."[3] To the Puritan, the importance of preaching lay not merely in the benefits derived from it, but "...in the fact that it was the declaration by the preacher of the revelation of God, confirmed in the hearts of the believers by the interior testimony of the Holy Ghost."[4] Even Hooker, while sceptical of the exclusive claim of preaching

---

1. Whitford, in his Werke for housholders, quoted by G.R.Owst, Preaching in Medieval England (Cambridge 1926), 93,note 3.
2. Letter to the Queen, concerning the prophesyings, December 20th, 1576 (Strype, Grindal, 561).
3. Ibid. 561-2.
4. H.Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans (1948),182. For a contemporary exaltation of a preacher's status, see George Phillips [a moderate Puritan], The Paines of a faithfull Pastor (1596).

as the medium of salvation,[1] granted the premise that "... preaching be the only ordinary mean whereby it pleaseth God to save our souls."[2]

With the premium put on preaching by the Reformation and the rise of an educated laity, there came the demand for a preaching ministry. Aylmer, doubtless influenced by continental practice, urged in his Harborow for Faithfull Subjectes, that "...everie parishe Churche may have his preacher,"[3] a theme well-worn by Puritan controversialists by the end of the reign.[4] Anglicans in responsible positions displayed greater caution, even Grindal acknowledging that "...if every flock might have a preaching Pastor, which is rather to be wished than hoped for."[5] Whitgift, in a conference with the Queen in 1585, boasting of the number of learned preachers "...that is in theis dayes, and doe and will increase daylye more and more," was yet realist enough to realise the impossibility of placing learned men in all the 13,000 parishes in the country.[6] The Queen, never an enthusiast for an extensive preaching ministry, concurred, and instructed her

---

1. Religious education, "conversation in the bosom of the church," reading, and conference, were other important instruments (The Works of...Richard Hooker (Oxford 1890), i, 496.
2. Ibid. 507.
3. Quoted in SP. ii, 210, note 3.
4. cf. SP. i, 133; ii, 229.
5. Strype, Grindal, 565.
6. PRO. SP. 12/176/68 (February 27th, 1585. cf. J.E. Neale, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601 (1957), 69-71.

archbishop to install, where learned men could not be found, "...honest sober and wise men, and such as can reade the scriptures and homilies well unto the people."

The state of ecclesiastical incomes was generally accepted, by Anglicans and Puritans alike, as being responsible for the existing limited number of preachers in the ministry. In Grindal's opinion, arrived at when he was archbishop of Canterbury, only one out of every seven churches was able to provide for a preacher.[1] Puritans attacked the abuses that were so often the cause of parochial poverty, impropriation of ecclesiastical revenue, or simoniac agreements between patron and cleric which divested the benefice of much of its emolument.[2] Vigilant episcopal supervision could help to regulate the latter practice, but impropriation was too deep-rooted by the Elizabethan period to envisage the restoration of income to the Church.[3] The authorities on the whole concentrated on improving the standards of ministerial recruits, by drawing as much as possible from the universities, and on providing practical incentives to attract able men into the ministry. By dispensing a man to hold a poor living in plurality, so long as he placed a preaching curate in his non-

---

1 Strype, Grindal, 565.

2 SP i, 170, 259; ii, 16, 17

3 cf Hill, 132-67 passim

resident cure, and periodically preached there himself, much could be done to alleviate the problems caused by the poverty of so many parishes. A more specific encouragement to preaching was the concession made in the statute of 1571, associating licensed preachers with holders of theological degrees as exclusively qualified for admission to benefices worth £30 or over in the Queen's Books.[1]

"Generally the Graduats of the University are only admitted to be preachers, unless it be some few which have excellent gifts of knowledg in the Scriptures, joyned with good utterance and godly perſwasion." Such was the policy laid down in 1576 by Grindal.[2] Diocesan standards were doubtless more variable in practice, but the general tendency to grant preaching licences only to university-trained clergymen links the increase of preachers with the increase in graduate recruitment. While the standard of preaching was to some extent protected from deterioration by this policy, it explains why at the end of the reign no more than 50% of the beneficed clergy in the country were estimated to be preachers.[3]

Our conclusions on the preponderance of graduates among the London incumbents in the later part of the reign in themselves

---

1. Statutes of the Realm (1819),iv,547 (13 El.c.12). These terms were adopted by Convocation in 1575 (Card.Synod. i,135-6).
2. Strype, Grindal, 563.
3. R.G.Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church (1910), i,241.

suggest that the proportion of preachers in the capital was far higher than the national average. Contemporaries were acutely aware of this discrepancy. As early as 1545, the ex-Franciscan, Henry Brinkelow wrote that "...the Gospell was never more sincerely preached in the tyme of the Apostles then it hath bene of late in London; nor never more godlye exposicions vppon the Scripture, and that a greate nombre, whereby to draw vs to Christ Jesus."[1] Elizabethans, preaching at Paul's Cross, were no less flattering to their audiences. Edward Bush in 1571, in the course of a formidable attack on abuses in the church, contrasted the unhappy state of the rural ministry with conditions in the capital. "...when I come out of the cuntry hither to the City, methink I come into another world, even out of darknes into light, for here the word of God is plentifully preached."[2] Many London sermons at this time were, according to Whitgift, who claimed David Whitehead's agreement on the point, "...loose, frivolous, and unprofitable,"[3] a criticism indignantly denied by Cartwright in his A replye to an answere made of M. Doctor Whitgift (c.1574). The London ministers who

---

1. The Lamentacyn of a Christen Agaynst the Cytye of London, made by Roderigo Mors, ed. J.M. Cowper, Early English Text Soc. xxii (1904), 96. Mors was the pseudonym under which Brinkelow wrote.
2. A Sermon preached at Pauls crosse on Trinity Sunday, 1571 (1576),f.iv.
3. An Answer to the Admonition (1572), The Works of John Whitgift, ed. J.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1853),iii,2.

preached twice a day were better, claimed Cartwright, than those "...which make the word of God novel and dainties, and, as M. Latimer pleasantly said, strawberries coming only at certain times of the year."[1]

Differences may have arisen on the quality of London preaching, but there was general unanimity as to its extensiveness. John Stockwood, despite his Puritan tendency to pick out the least redeeming facets of ecclesiastical practice, admitted this at Paul's Cross in 1578;[2] two years later, James Bisse from the same pulpit warned London that divine wrath on unrepentant citizens would be all the greater for that "...thou art taught the will of thy father more then other thy sisters of England."[3] William Fisher, one of Aylmer's chaplains, was less pessimistic. "There is good cause," he forecast,[4] "the Citie of London should become an other Thessalonica, in seeking and honouring our Phisition Christ Jesus. There is so much Preaching, and so diligent hearing, that needs there must be some following." Later preachers painted similar pictures, drawing from them somewhat different morals. At the end of the reign, Francis Marbury expressed concern about the infiltration of Catholics into the City, despite the fact that "...there are now more sufficient

---

1. Ibid. 5.
2. A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse (1578);20,177.
3. A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1581),54.
4. A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1580),f.2r.

preachers of Gods word amongst you, then ever ther were."[1]

The impressions of contemporary observers can be tested by statistical information. Of the numerous surveys of clerical qualifications made by the diocese authorities during the course of the reign, only those of 1560 and 1561 survive for the City. The disappearance of the certificates compiled in 1576, 1585, 1592-3, and 1602-3 constitutes a grave but not irretrievable loss in so far as information on preachers is concerned. In the first place, there is available the survey of the London ministry made in 1586 by the Puritans as part of their campaign in the Parliament of 1586-7 for a more learned ministry. Admittedly a partisan document, it nevertheless forms a useful supplementary source of information.[2] A more valuable compensation for the loss of the clerical certificates is provided by the lists of preaching licences issued by the bishop of London, which are contained in the vicar-general books.[3] Although these records do not commence until 1577, they are henceforward virtually complete until the end of the reign,[4] and deserve close study by virtue of their rarity among diocesan archives. Archiepiscopal licences are also available;[5]

---

1. A Sermon Preached at Pauls X (1602), f.5v.
2. Infra, pp.152-3
3. LCCRO. Lib.V.G. Hamond, Stanhope.
4. The vicar-general records for 1600 and part of 1601 are missing.
5. They are recorded in the archiepiscopal registers. A manuscript index of such licences exists at Lambeth.

of particular relevance is the list, compiled during the archbishop's inspection of his faculty office in the course of his provincial visitation of 1569, of preaching licences granted since March 1565.[1] There remain, however, a number of clergy who fell outside these categories. Many are known to have been preachers from references in visitation and parochial records; others with degrees in theology can be assumed to have held licences.[2]

---

1. PRO. SP. 12/60/213.
2. cf. The State of the Church in ... the Diocese of Lincoln, ed. C.W.Foster, Lincoln Reg. Soc.23 (1926),1,lvii.

(1) PREACHING INCUMBENTS

DATE[1]	TOTAL OF KNOWN INCUMBENTS	PREACHERS	NON-PREACHERS	UNCERTAIN
1561	78	34	44	-
1577	92	49	34	9
1586	92	73	19	-
PURITAN[2] SURVEY (1586)	90	63	27	-
1601	95	84	7	4

The 1561 figures are based on the certificates drawn up in that year by Grindal for the archbishop;[3] no returns were made for twelve parish churches, which have consequently been omitted from this analysis.[4] Sixteen of the thirty-four

---

1. The dates are arbitrary, chosen for convenience. 1561 has been taken rather than 1560 because the certificates for the former year are more complete. Where there was a change of incumbent during any of the years analysed, the cleric in possession for the greater part of the year has been taken.
2. Only the parishes in the Survey which come under the area of this study have been included; the Southwark parishes and most of the 'out-parishes' have therefore been excluded. The Survey unaccountably omitted St.Mary Islington from its list. The inclusion of Mathew (R. of St. John Walbrook), and Pegrim (R. of St. Olave Silver St.), both admitted post-April,1586, indicate that the Survey was drawn up in the early summer of 1586.
3. Parker Certificates, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MS. 122,pp.78-98) transcribed by Mullins, 269-85.
4. They were the 4 peculiars of St. Paul's; St. Botolph Bishopsgate, St. Antholin, St. Olave Hart St., St. Peter in the Tower, and 4 minor curacies (ibid.226).

preachers were licensed by authority to deliver sermons either in their own parishes or elsewhere; the remainder preached only within their own cures, for which at that date no licence was required. No satisfactory assessment could be attempted for the period between 1561-1576 because of omissions in the lists of known incumbents, and the lack of information from vicar-general and visitation books prior to 1577. The estimates from that year onwards benefit from the available lists of preaching licences, but reliance on that source demands a preliminary qualification. Some incumbents, whose licences were not obtained until after 1577, are known to have been regular preachers both in their own parishes and elsewhere before this date.[1] If so, they have been included in the 1577 figures as preachers, but it is possible that others whose licences were dated post-1577, and concerning whom we have no earlier record, may nevertheless have preached without licence before this date. John Horsfall, for instance, had been the rector of St. Peter Paul's Wharf for almost seven years before he was granted a licence,[2] while John Dodd, licensed in 1579, had been rector of St. George Botolph Lane since 1570.[3] Such cases must perforce be included in the non-preaching columns in the 1577 estimate

---

1. e.g. Wm. Wager, licensed in 1579, had preached twice-weekly at St. Benet Gracechurch since 1571 (GLMS.1568,p.223).
2. LCCRO. Lib.V.G. Hamond, f.185v.
3. Ibid. f.187v.

for lack of information as to their preaching activity prior to their obtaining a licence.

The 1586 figures are rather more definite. Nine years of episcopal administration by Aylmer had ensured that all preaching incumbents were suitably licensed. Confirmation is obtainable from the 1586 visitation book which recorded the preachers[1] in the diocesan jurisdiction, and from the list of non-preachers who were required to attend exercises for their edification in that year.[2] The complete character of the 1586 figures enables us to check the accuracy of the Puritan survey of the London clergy compiled in that year.[3] One error in the name of an incumbent occurs, the rector of St. Mary Mounthaw being described as Halewood rather than Horsfall.[4] The survey was substantially accurate on the preaching or non-preaching character of incumbents, and only five discrepancies have been found; Thomas Phillips, David Dee, Richard Caser, John Denton and Thomas Mortibois, non-preachers according to the survey, all possessed licences at this date.[5] Some mistakes also occurred in the description of the admittedly obscure

---

1. GLMS. 9537/6.
2. Ibid.
3. SP. ii,180-4.
4. Ibid. 182; cf. Henn,348. Foster, V. of St. Bride,was wrongly described as curate (SP. ii,181).
5. LCCRO. Lib.VG. Hamond, ff.88v,171v,187v; Stanhope, i,77v.

holders of perpetual curacies,[1] and in two instances, the preaching ability of the incumbent, known to have held a licence, is ignored.[2] These slips tended somewhat to colour the picture of a non-preaching ministry that was presented to Parliament, but on the whole the authors of the survey were fairly accurate in compiling their evidence.[3]

The 1601 figures have likewise been compiled from information derived from the vicar-general records and the visitation book of 1598 when careful particulars were made of the preaching status of incumbents.[4] No evidence is available for four parsons who were either admitted post-1598 or were incumbents of peculiars outside the episcopal jurisdiction.[5]

The growth of an extensive preaching ministry in London was remarkable; within two generations the proportion among the beneficed clergy had increased from slightly less than 44% to over 87%. The increase reflected in exaggerated form tendencies elsewhere. In the diocese of Worcester, we are

---

1. Egerton is described as the parson of St. Anne Blackfriars (SP.ii,180); he was in fact the lecturer. The incumbent was Dee, and the impropriate rector Sir George Moore.
2. Dee, P C. of St. Anne Blackfriars (SP.ii,180); Morrison, P C. of St. Botolph Aldersgate (181).
3. cf. Foster, op.cit. i,xxxiv. "It is evident from the close agreement of the Survey with the Liber Cleri that the former was compiled with great care."
4. GLMS. 9537/9.
5. Jenks (R. of St. Dionis Backchurch), Hinde (R. of St. Peter Paul's Wharf), Merrick (R. of St. Michael Crooked Lane), and Parks (P C. of the Minories). Henks and Parks were graduates, and so were quite possibly authorised preachers.

told,[1] forty out of 165 beneficed clergy were preachers in 1561 - a proportion of under 25%. Improvement was imperceptible before 1576, but quickened in the second half of the reign, although as late as 1592 fewer than 50% could preach.[2] Of 288 beneficed ministers in Devon in 1561, 223 did not preach;[3] in the adjoining county of Cornwall there were, according to the Puritan survey, only twenty-nine preachers in 160 livings in 1586.[4] By 1592, numbers were greater in many places, Chester having as many as 172 preachers, and the diocese of York over 200.[5] In the archdeaconries of Stow and Lincoln in 1603, the combined totals were 228 preachers and 292 'dumb dogs'.[6] For the whole diocese of Lincoln the number of preachers had risen from 211 out of 1,285 in 1585 to 712 out of 1,184 in 1603.[7]

London, therefore, was exceptional not in recording an improvement during the course of the reign, but in the extent of the proportionate increase. No other area, it appears, could boast of a 54% preaching clergy as early as 1577, rising to 79% within the following decade, and to over 87% by 1601. The

---

1. D.M.Barratt, The Condition of the Parish Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester, and Gloucester, (unpublished D.Phil. thesis Oxford, 1949), 93.
2. Ibid. 100.
3. A.L.Rowse, Tudor Cornwall (1941), 324.
4. Ibid. 338.
5. A.Tindal Hart, Unlearned and Ignorant Men, Church Quarterly Review, No.323, clvii (1956), 194.
6. Ibid. 194
7. Foster, op.cit. lvii.

explanations largely lay with the steady increase of graduates among the London incumbents, for reasons already discussed. The predominance of ecclesiastical patrons, the early recovery from the clerical dearth in the years immediately following the Queen's accession, the increasing competition for London livings post-1577 as a result partly of the opportunities for lectureships that were springing up, all contributed to raising the academic standards of the Ministry. This was almost automatically reflected in an increase in the number of preacher for few London incumbents post-1570 who were academically qualified to preach, could have neglected the opportunity at a time when there existed such possibilities for augmentation of income. A lecturing position was doubtless the most lucrative, but funeral and commemorative sermons offered subsidiary emolument that only the most affluent incumbent could afford to spurn.

The improvement in academic standards does not entirely explain the remarkable proportionate increase of preaching incumbents, for, as can be seen from a comparison of the two tables,[1] the number of preachers, rather less than the total of graduates in the early years of the reign, exceeded the other by a substantial margin by 1601. In the 1561 certificates, thirteen graduates were described as non-preachers in their

---

1. Supra, p.p. 91, 150.

London livings,[1] and although this was to a certain extent compensated by the nine non-graduates who were preachers,[2] - most of them in their own parishes only -, the total of preachers still lagged behind the total of graduates. Two of the non-preaching incumbents possessed doctorates in divinity, one having given up his preaching duties '_propter senectutem_',[3] the other being non-resident.[4] The majority of the group were veteran clerics, ordained before the Edwardian reformation had placed a novel emphasis on ministerial preaching functions.[5] Of the only two in the group who had been ordained post-1559, Henry Bedell was shortly afterwards authorised to preach by the bishop,[6] but Thomas Jenkinson, throughout his thirty years' incumbency,[7] apparently never aspired to that status.

A slight discrepancy still existed in 1577 when fifty-six incumbents were known to be graduates and forty-nine were preachers, while two of the nine whose preaching status is uncertain,[8] were graduates. The majority of the non-preaching

---

1. John Armerar, Henry Bedell, Edward Crome, Richard Kettell, Thomas Jenkinson, Robert Cooke, Humphrey Perkins, Ralph Whytlin, Thomas Genins, John Weale, John Willoughby, Thomas Chipping, and William Genyns (Mullins, 269-85).
2. William Baldwin, Thomas Walbutt, William Aylward, John Devers, John Gough, John Dean, Miles Garrard, Patrick Freebarne, and John Philpot. Gough and Philpot alone were licensed to preach outside their own cures.
3. Crome (Mullins, 284).
4. Perkin (_ibid._ 280). He was licensed before 1569 (PRO.SP.12/60 213).
5. Kettell, Crome, Weale, Willoughby.
6. PRO. SP. 12/60/213.
7. He was not recorded as a preacher in the Puritan Survey (_SP._ ii,182) nor in the 1583 visitation (GLMS. 9537/5 [no fol.]).
8. John Horsfall (R. of St. Peter Paul's Wharf), and John Smyth (R. of St. Alban Wood St.)

graduates of 1561 had died;[1] one of the few survivors obtained a licence, apparently for the first time, in 1577.[2] Henceforward, while Aylmer did not always follow Grindal's advice to issue licences only to graduates, it became quite exceptional to find a non-preaching graduate admitted to a City living. Henry Fletcher appears to have been the sole instance, and his preferment was confined to the perpetual curacy of St. James Clerkenwell.[3] He was obliged to perform exercises in 1585-6, but evidently failed to reach a sufficient standard to be awarded a licence.[4]

By 1601, the number of authorised preachers was far in excess of the total of graduates, unprecedented in the post-Reformation period as was the latter. The awarding of licences to those inferior clergy who had proved satisfactory in the exercises imposed upon them by virtue of Whitgift's orders of 1586, accounted in a subsidiary way for this improvement. Richard Lightfoot, Michael Hill, and Thomas Earl all learnt to preach the hard way, the latter commencing his preaching career at the age of sixty-eight, and after an incumbency that had already lasted for over twenty years.[5] Seven other non-graduate

---

1. Armerar (died in 1563); Crome (1562); Kettell (1562); Cooke (1563(4)); Thomas Genins (1565); William Genins (1566); Willoughby (resigned 1562); Weale (1569); and Chipping (resigned c.1571). Perkins and Whytlin both died in 1578.
2. Whytlin (LCCRO. Lib.VG. Hamond, f.87r.).
3. Alumni Cantab, 1,ii,149.
4. LCCRO. Lib.Corr.1583-6, xvi, f.12r.; GLMS. 9537/6, f.113v.
5. LCCRO. Lib.VG. Stanhope,i,f.144v.

who had obtained possession of a living post-1587 were all authorised preachers, licensed on their admission or at the start of their pre-incumbency career in the capital.[1] While there were twenty-three non-graduates beneficed in London in 1601, there were only seven non-preachers, one of whom held a B.A. degree.[2]

Neither of these influences completely explains the most pronounced proportionate increase, that which occurred between 1577 and 1586 when the number of preachers rose by a minimum of fifteen and a maximum of twenty-four. Within the same decade there occurred a widespread extension of the system of parish lectureships, hardly a pure coincidence.[3] In the first place, the vestry of a parish where a lectureship existed or was planned, might exert pressure on the patron to present a man capable of delivering the lectures. From the clerical point of view, the incumbent was seldom in a position to discard an opportunity for augmenting his income in this way, and consequently sued for authority to preach in circumstances where otherwise he might have neglected the function. This factor leads to the question of the facility by which preaching licences could be obtained under Aylmer, undoubtedly the key

---

1. Michael Gifford, William Jackson, Peter Vermyne, John Clarke, James Stopes, Richard Lightfoot, William Stepney.
2. Henry Fletcher (B.A.); Paul Bushe, William Hall, John Hallward, Hugh Andrews, William Morrell, and Richard Bull. The status of 4 others is uncertain.
3. cf. Chapter VIII.

to the increase of preachers within this decade.

The general requirements necessary for the grant of a licence, - examination of capacities, testimonials of qualities, and subscription to articles that became more stringent as the reign progressed -, are discussed later; here we are only concerned to record and explain the prolific number of licences, issued under Aylmer's seal of office, in the early years of his episcopate. Between June of 1577 and March 25th, 1580, 106 preaching licences were issued to ministers within London diocese, forty-eight between June 11th 1577 and March 24th, 1578, thirty-two in the following year, and twenty-six in 1579.[1] Henceforward, the annual figure until Aylmer's death in 1594 was less than twenty,[2] with the exception of 1581, 1586, 1588 and 1589; two of these years were those of an episcopal visitation, when the number of licences tended to be above the average following the detection of unlicensed preachers at the visitation sessions.

The non-survival of the lists of licences issued pre-1577 prevents a comparison of Aylmer's activities with those of his predecessors. In 1595, the first year of his successor, Fletcher's term of office, and a visitation year, fifty-two licences were issued, a higher figure than any of Aylmer's

---

1. LCCRO. Lib.VG. Hamond, ff.72r.-250r., passim.
2. 1580: 8 1583: 17 1586: 24 1589: 39 1592: 18
   1581: 21 1584: 11 1587: 18 1590: 16 1593: 12.
   1582: 16 1585: 19 1588: 24 1591: 11

annual totals.[1] Subsequently, however, the numbers dwindled sharply, and not one grant was recorded for the years 1599, 1602 and 1603. The concentration of licences in the years of a bishop's primary visitation,- witness 1577 and 1595 -, reflects both the early enthusiasm of the ordinary in correcting those who preached without licence, and the negligence of the preceding bishop in failing to detect such offenders. While the growth of nonconformity in his diocese made imperative such tightening of control of preachers, it cannot exclusively account for the issue of so many licences during these years. Aylmer's own interest in a preaching ministry must form a contributory factor.

Aylmer's efforts to increase the number of preachers among the clergy, so long as they remained under close supervision, was mentioned by Strype,[2] and confirmed by the active part played by the bishop in the privy council scheme of 1581 to set up public preachers in the City,[3] and by his efforts to uphold the reputation of Paul's Cross at a time when it was becoming difficult to secure the services of eminent divines for that pulpit. It is therefore quite possible that City incumbents, first authorised to preach in the late '70s, were spurred to do

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, passim.
2. Strype, Aylmer, 148.
3. cf. Chapter VIII, pp 428-30

so by the bishop's encouragement. Ralph Whytlin, a veteran pre-Elizabethan ordinand who, although holding a degree in civil law, was described as a non-preacher in the 1561 certificate,[1] was granted a licence by Aylmer to preach in certain parishes within the diocese, including St. Andrew Holborn, in September 1577.[2] This was issued before the London phase of the episcopal visitation of that year took place, so that it could not have been an example of an unlicensed preacher being brought under closer supervision. Whytlin's own limitations, - in 1560 it was reported that he '<u>legit tantum officia divina</u>'[3] -, and his age, suggests that Aylmer's examination of the candidate was not always rigorously carried out.

More precise information on Aylmer's attitude is ascertainable from the licences issued to ministers admitted to a living after his accession. Graduates who accepted beneficâes within the diocesan jurisdiction in the first three years of Aylmer's episcopate - as indeed later - were generally issued with licences shortly after their institution,[4] if they did not already possess one by virtue of previous pastoral experience in London diocese. Non-graduate recruits

---

1. Mullins, 269.
2. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.87r.
3. Mullins, 267.
4. e.g. Andrew Castleton (R. of St. Martin Iremonger); instituted January 16th, 1577, obtained a preaching licence June 11th, 1577 (LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.72r.)

to City livings were likewise often given a licence by Aylmer soon after their admission. John Barker, first recorded as the perpetual curate of St. Katherine Cree in 1577, obtained authority to preach in the following year,[1] while Thomas Cobhed was granted licences to serve and preach in the donative of Holy Trinity Minories in 1578 and 1579 respectively.[2] Samson Masheder, instituted to the rectory of St. George Botolph Lane in May 1580, received his licence some months later.[3] Together with the trend to tighten control over preachers, Aylmer's enthusiasm for a preaching ministry must account for the large number of licences granted between 1577-79, which in turn constituted the most important reason for the spectacular rise in the number of preachers in the post-1577 decade.

(ii) PREACHING REGULATIONS

The control of the number, utterances, and activities of preachers by means of licences was well-established in England a century before the Reformation, as was the reaction of nonconformists to the premise that to preach was conditional on the purchase of a licence. The Puritan Nicholas Standen's defiance of Grindal in 1565, - "...he reedeth not of suche order [of licences] used in the prymatyve churches and therefore myght preach without lycense" -,[4] found a close precedent in the

---

1. Ibid, f.121v.
2. Ibid. ff.140r.,162r.
3. Ibid. f.246r.
4. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Huick, f.116r.

Wycliffite Swinderby's claim that "...both priestes and deacons that God hath ordained deacons or priestes bene holden by power given to them of God to preach."[1] The Protestant established church, confronted by similar problems of left-wing dissidence, merely elaborated on existing instruments of control.

Until Elizabeth's reign, licences were required only for those who preached outside their own cure. This medieval usage had been absorbed into the royal injunctions of Henry VIII,[2] and was still being repeated in Elizabeth's injunctions of 1559.[3] The 1561 certificates for London, as elsewhere, reflect this duality, recording details of licences only for those clerics who ranged outside their own parishes. With the growth of Puritan nonconformity demanding a tighter form of clerical discipline, this position became transparently anomalous; a Puritan was as much a potential threat to orthodoxy by preaching nonconformist doctrine weekly from his own pulpit as he was by engaging in itinerant campaigning. The regulations were amended in the Advertisements of 1565, where it was laid down that "... no parson or curate, not admitted by the bysshope of the dioces to preache, do expounde in his own cure, or elsewhere, but only study to reade gravely and aptly, without any glosing of the same, or any additions, the homelyes already sett oute..."[4]

---

1. Owst, op.cit. 134, note 1.
2. The Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, ed. W.H.Frere (1910), ii, 39.
3. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 180.
4. Ibid. 291.

This amendment was confirmed in the 1571 canons,[1] and finally incorporated in church law in 1604,[2] although in practice it appears that some diocesan authorities allowed ministers to expound without licence in their own cures until late in the reign.[3]

The right to grant licences was by the Elizabethan period shared between Crown, archbishop, bishop, and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.[4] The former rarely exerted its right, and not one of the London preachers whose licences are recorded claimed royal authority. Holders of a university licence were in a privileged position, being free to preach in any part of the country, and being exempt from the normal ecclesiastical regulations.[5] Despite the immunity it provided, a university licence was not always confined to the most illustrious scholars though a M.A. title was regarded as a minimum requirement.[6] On

---

1. Card. Synod. i, 126.
2. No. XLIX (ibid.274-5).
3. cf. W.J.Kaye, Yorkshire Notes, An Ecclesiastical Summary of The Province and Diocese of York in 1603, The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal,XXXI (1934), 421-2. The 1603 certificates recorded that many preachers "...such as not beeing publickly licenced, yet preach in their owne parrishes with commendation of which sorte there are very many." I am indebted to Mr.E.L.C. Mullins for this information.
4. cf. 1571 Canons (Card. Synod.i,126). The 1559 Injunctions also empowered the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to grant licences but this was revoked shortly afterwards (Frere, op.cit.iii,11).
5. Until March 1603, subscription to the royal supremacy, Book of Common Prayer, and the 39 Articles, long obligatory for ecclesiastical licences, was not required in Oxford (Register of the University of Oxford, ed. A.Clark (Oxford 1887),ii,Pt.i,131).
6. Ibid. 130.
7. Ibid. 131.

occasion, it was issued to dispose of an immediate problem, such as William Ligh's request for a licence "...because he was going to preach at S. Paul's Cross, but could not do so without the licence."[1] Of the London incumbents, however, only Nicholas Felton, rector of St. Antholin and St. Mary le Bow in the '90s and later the bishop of Ely, was actually recorded as entitled to preach by virtue of the licence he held from Cambridge University,[2] although several others, formerly preachers in one of the universities, may also have possessed them.[3]

Archiepiscopal licences were less infrequent.[4] They could cover the whole of the province, certain dioceses, or specific parishes. The conditions of their issue were similar to those of episcopal licences, discussed below. Their advantage over the latter lay in their inter-diocesan validity (unless otherwise stated), useful for incumbents preferred to livings in another diocese. A number of London clergymen held archiepiscopal licences in Parker's time,[5] but their ranks

---

1. Ibid. 131.
2. GLMS. 9537/8, f.77v.
3. e.g. John King, John Randall, John Dixe, William Sage, George Boleyn, John Copcott.
4. They are to be found in the archbishop's registers. A manuscript index of such licences exists at Lambeth.
5. Over 250 licences, issued out of the archiepiscopal faculty office between March 1st, 1565 and Parker's visitation of 1569, are recorded in PRO. SP.12/60/213. 28 were held by clergymen who at some time were London incumbents.

dwindled later, most post-1577 incumbents being issued with episcopal licences.

Episcopal grants were issued under seal, and generally authorised the holder to preach 'per totam diocesim.'[1] On occasion, more limited grants were made, covering certain churches and areas only; Thomas Cobhed in 1579 was licensed to preach in parts of the diocese "...Civitate London duntaxat excepta,"[2] while the veteran Ralph Whytlin was in 1578 authorised to preach in five churches only.[3] Licences were by no means confined to ministers holding a living or curacy; sometimes they were obtained by recently-ordained clerics, with no regular cure, whose immediate activities appear to have revolved around free-lance lecturing in the City.[4] Aylmer was an ardent supporter of an extensive preaching ministry, beneficed and unbeneficed, in his diocese, so long as candidates passed his scrutiny, and were authorised by his seal. An extract from the notebook of Thomas Earl brings out the bishop's policy of subjecting preachers to his authority. Ten beneficed City clergymen were told in 1587 that the possession of a B.A. or M.A. degree, or another bishop's licence did not exempt them

---

1. e.g. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.72r.
2. Ibid. f.137r.
3. Ibid. f.87r. He was incumbent of two of these churches (St. Andrew Holborn and Curringham in Essex).
4. e.g. Arthur Bright (ibid. f.85v.), licensed 1577, not beneficed till 1582.

from the obligation to procure a licence from Aylmer.[1] Earl's memory, - his book, was written about 1600 -, was unreliable, for several of the men he mentioned had already obtained such licences.[2] At least one of them, however, preached by virtue of a licence granted him by Archbishop Parker,[3] and although Aylmer in fact failed to revoke it, the incident reflects his attempt to centralise authority upon himself,[4] a realistic enough policy at a time when strict control over London preachers was essential.

Licences could be used to bring about this control in three ways; by means of conditions imposed before a licence was granted, by periodical withdrawing of existing licences, and their re-issue to suitable recipients only, and by disciplinary measures against unlicensed preachers. Judging from the London licensing lists, the conditions of a licence were extremely elastic before Whitgift's accession to the metropolitan see. Candidates were required to produce written testimonials of their capacity to preach from sponsors who included authorised preachers. Diligent examination of "...theire conformity in unity of doctrine, established by publique authority" was laid

---

1. CUL. MS. Mm,1,29, f.46v.
2. Bond (lic.1581); Turnbull (lic.1581); Green (lic.1577); Tripp (lic.1577).
3. John Presse, R. of St. Matthew Friday St; licensed by Parker (GLMS. 9537/6, f.124r.).
4. cf. the Puritan complaints that church wardens of Essex parishes were in 1584 bound to allow none to preach "...but such as the Bishop shall assign." (Addtl.MS. 48064, f.67r.).

down by the Advertisements of 1565,[1] and was the responsibility of the bishop himself. Before 1580 the only condition recorded was that the candidate "...dumodo nullas innovationes vel contentiones de rebus iam constitutis suscitet vel docet."[2]; henceforward, subscription to the royal supremacy and the 1562 articles was generally, but not invariably, added.[3]

More details are available for the crucial post-1583 licensing regulations in London. The names of the sponsors who provided the testimonials were generally recorded; occasionally, a candidate was admitted without testimonial because he was 'bene notus' to bishop, vicar-general, or an episcopal chaplain,[4] or had preached a trial sermon before Aylmer.[5] The latter technique was sometimes employed with candidates suspected of nonconformity, about whom further information was required.[6] More important was the tightening of the subscription regulations, following the publication of Whitgift's eleven articles in 1583. Their application in London diocese was belated; not until April 1585 was the first preaching grant issued under the new conditions, when Stephen Gosson, just ordained priest by Aylmer, obtained a licence after subscribing to "...articulis Synodalibus et Archiepalibus."[7] Subsequently,

---

1. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 289.
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, ff.721-250r. passim.
3. Ibid. Stanhope, i,f.4r.
4. Ibid. f.263r.
5. Ibid. ff.47v., 61r.
6. e.g. Richard Barlow (ibid. f.47v).
7. Ibid, f.44r.

the practice varied sharply, the majority of licences being still conditional merely on the recipient's good behaviour and forbearance from innovations.

In the first place, a distinction was made between beneficed and unbeneficed applicants; those already instituted were not required to subscribe. Thomas Phillips, for instance, the rector of St. Augustine for thirteen years before he obtained a licence, was exempted;[1] Jonas Hardfield, suing for authority to preach three years after his institution to the rectory of St. Mary Abcurch,[2] subscribed only to the 1562 articles, while Thomas Earl, an incumbent of over twenty years' standing, was not required to subscribe at all.[3] Many unbeneficed applicants for licences were likewise excepted, some of them post-1583 London ordinands who had presumably subscribed before their admission to the ministry,[4] others curates who had subscribed on being authorised to serve a cure.[5] In fact, only where the applicant was a possible nonconformist, was subscription to Whitgift's articles recorded in the preaching grant during Aylmer's time; Richard Salt, who had for a time preached without

---

1. Ibid. f.77v.
2. Ibid. f.60v.
3. Ibid. f.144v.
4. e.g. John Heyney; ordained deacon and priest 1584, preaching licence 1585, R. of St. Mary Somerset 1585 (ibid. f.67r.).
5. e.g. Walter Pegrim; subscribed to 1583 articles on obtaining a licence to serve at St. Margaret New Fish St. (Nov.12th,1585); subscribed only to the 1562 articles on being granted a preaching licence January 15th, 1586. (ibid. f.67r., f.76r.)

a licence in Christ Church parish, and who was later cited for his unorthodox way of administering the communion, was required to do so,[1] as was David English, a Scotsman, and protégé of the Presbyterian divine, Andrew Melville.[2] Ralph Howdon, a noted Essex Puritan, took advantage of Aylmer's absence from Fulham in May, 1586, to be licensed without subscription, by an episcopal servant.[3] Others avoided subscription by securing testimonials from patrons, too powerful for the bishop to defy; Henry Legrys, for instance, son of an Essex Puritan, was well protected by the commendation of the Earl of Essex in 1590.[4] The most notable case of such evasion was that of Richard Greenham, who in 1591 moved from his Cambridgeshire vicarage into London. A lifelong nonconformist, he was yet granted a licence in 1592 without any form of subscription, by virtue of a testimonial from William Fisher, an episcopal chaplain, and a promise from Thomas Fanshaw, Remembrancer of the Exchequer, that "...dictus Greeneham nullas innovationes aut contentiones de rebus suscitet vel spargat."[5]

In Aylmer's time, then, applicants for preaching licences

---

1. Ibid. f.77v.
2. Ibid. f.20v.
3. Ibid. f.91v. cf. SP.ii,164-5.
4. Lib. V.G. Stanhope,ii,f.16r. "Notwithstanding," a postscript adds, "Richard Goodman (a court official) gott hym to subscribe to the articles of Religion Anno 1562." His father was Nicholas Le Grys, an Essex incumbent. (SP,ii,160).
5. Ibid. f.60v.

who had already subscribed on ordination, institution, or admission to a cure, were rarely obliged to repeat their vows. The exceptions were suspected nonconformists who, however, on occasion were able to avoid it, if backed by an influential patron. Incumbents instituted before 1584, but who only later sought authority to preach, did not subscribe. Post-Aylmerian practice was on similar lines, though occasionally a curate, who allowed some time to elapse between his obtaining a licence to serve and to preach, was found to have repeated his subscription oath to Whitgift's articles. Melchisedeck Francis, for instance, subscribed on securing a curate's licence in 1591; three years later, he sued for a preaching licence, conforming '_promptum et paratum_' to the articles of 1562 and 1583.[1] Ministers of post-nonconformist tendencies, like Humphrey Wildblood, Richard Gawton, and Thomas Barber, who supplicated for authority to preach during Bishop Fletcher's term of office, were all required to subscribe;[2] possibly they lacked the social influence of some of their Puritan predecessors of Aylmer's day.

It is clear from references in the licensing grants that it was customary for the recipient to bind himself to the due performance of the terms imposed upon the issue of the licence. Unfortunately, we have no information on the conditions of the

---

1. _Ibid_. f.183r.
2. _Ibid_. iii, ff.24l., 35v, 70v.

bond, the sum of money involved, and the security required, as reference was only made to a bond when the recipient was exempted from the obligation. William Lyndsell, for instance, neither entered into a bond nor subscribed on obtaining a licence in 1588 because his mentor "...assumspit in se quod dictus Lyndsell subscriberet infra Duos menses."[1] Similarly, Richard Greenham was authorised to preach without "...ulla subscriptione vel obligatione facta vel capta"[2], for reasons already mentioned. No record of proceedings following defaulting on bonds has been traced, although, as will be seen, licences were not infrequently withdrawn from those who had not observed their conditions.

This latter technique could be employed on a mass or individual scale. The calling in of preaching licences was no Elizabethan innovation, as Parker hastened to reassure Grindal in 1565. Cranmer was compelled "...twice or thrice in his time" to call in and re-issue licences "...with addition partly of certain clauses, and partly bonds not to disturb the state of religion stablished by public authority."[3] In December, 1558, the Queen, disturbed by the undisciplined preaching rampant in her capital, had issued a proclamation which for a short time inhibited all preaching activity.[4] Royal concern for "...a more

---

1. Ibid. i,f.203r.
2. Ibid. ii,f.60v.
3. Correspondence of Matthew Parker, ed. J.Bruce, Parker Soc. (Cambridge, 1853), 242.
4. . Card. Doc. Annals,i,208-10.

diligent choice of such as shall sue for such [preaching] licences", was also responsible for Parker's order in May 1565,[1] calling in all licences, re-issuing them "...to those meet for the same", and henceforward inhibiting all preachers whose licences were dated before April 1st, 1565.[2] Further general withdrawals of licences and their renewal to those considered suitable, were laid down in the 1571 canons when all licences dated before April 30th, 1569 were invalidated,[3] and in the Convocation articles of 1575, which declared void all licences bearing a date before February 8th, 1576.[4] The more stringent conditions imposed on the issue of grants post-1583 diminished the necessity for periodical examination of preachers, and Whitgift does not appear to have relied at all on the technique fashionable with his predecessors. The London clergy, however, were enjoined by Aylmer in 1587 to bring in their licences for inspection and re-issue, if approved;[5] possibly the order to the ten preachers, who claimed independent

---

1. Correspondence, 242.
2. The date laid down in the Advertisements was March 1st, 1565 (Card. Doc. Annals, i,324). Possibly the change was due to the delayed publication of the Advertisements. Injunctions concerning preachers issued later in the decade, were based on the dating stipulated in the Advertisements. (cf. The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. W.Nicholson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1843), 293-4).
3. Card. Synod, i.126. In June 1571, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners issued an injunction inhibiting all preachers whose licences did not derive from the Crown, archbishop, or bishop, and were dated pre-May 1st, 1571. (Parker Corr. 382-3).
4. Card. Synod, i,136.
5. CUL. MS. Mm, 1,29,f.41r.

authority, to procure episcopal licences, was a consequence of this enquiry.

The activities of individual preachers could be regulated by the same technique, for the donor of a grant reserved the right to withdraw the licence if a recipient was deemed to have breached its conditions of issue. The London records suggest that the right was rarely claimed in practice, the holder of a licence dated according to the latest requirement, and which was duly exhibited on demand, finding little difficulty in retaining a life-interest in it, so long as he was not cited for flagrant nonconformity. The latter qualification appears to have accounted for the tribulations of Thomas Cobhed, the outstanding exception to the customary practice of a permanent grant. At one time a Wiltshire vicar, he had eventually made his way to London "...in hope to have doen better among his frends..."[1] A short-term curacy in Stepney was followed by a period of itinerant preaching, for which he was authorised by an episcopal licence '<u>per totam dio-cesim</u>'[2] in October 1577. A year later he was serving in the Minories, the most nonconformist enclave in London, and was probably involved in the incidents of that summer which culminated in Aylmer laying an interdict against the church.[3]

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1574-6, f.192r.
2. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.88v.
3. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.122r.

His licence was evidently withdrawn, for in February, 1579, he was issued with another, authorising him to preach in certain parts of the diocese with the expressly stated exception of the City of London.[1] Within less than a month, he was licensed to serve in the Minories after a special bond touching his behaviour had been entered upon.[2] His existing preaching licence did not cover this parish, and so he shortly afterwards received another, valid for the whole diocese.[3] An entry in the archbishop's register records that Cobhead was granted a licence to preach in the dioceses of Canterbury, Winchester and Lincoln in April 1580;[4] whether this was intended to supplement his episcopal faculty, or was due to his moving out of London having again lost the latter, is not clear, but by 1581 he was once again preaching in a City parish.[5] He was certainly deprived of his episcopal licence sometime before 1587, for in that year yet another was granted to him,[6] on the testimonial of Thomas Pullison, a Puritan-inclined alderman, the veteran nonconformist Robert Crowley, and another City incumbent.[7] His death shortly afterwards must have relieved the burdens of

---

1. Ibid. f.137r.
2. Ibid. f.140r.
3. Ibid. f.162r. (May 13th, 1579).
4. Lambeth M.S. Reg. Grindal, f.197r.
5. St. Martin Orgar (GLMS. 959/1, f.46r.).
6. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, 1,f.188r. (November 10th).
7. Henry Tripp, R. of St. Stephen Walbrook, and occasionally an examining chaplain at Aylmer's ordinations.

both bishop and registrar, but lost London a popular preacher.[1]

Coincidental with the establishment of a net-work of regulations and conditions attached to the issue and periodical re-issue of preaching grants was the campaign against unlicensed preachers. Numerous canons, convocation articles, injunctions, visitation articles and precepts dealing with the problem were issued during the course of the reign. At visitations a principal duty of the visitor was to examine the credentials of ministers who chimed to be preachers. A motive behind the periodical recall of licences was to detect those which were invalid. On the parochial level, curates and church-wardens were repeatedly urged to scrutinise the qualifications of visiting preachers before they were admitted into the pulpit.

In London the limitless opportunities for casual sermons by unattached, itinerant preachers demanded constant vigilance on the part of the ordinary, and accounts for the frequency with which provincial regulations for the control of unlicensed preachers was supplemented by injunctions covering the City only. These were concentrated on two of the most turbulent periods in London ecclesiastical politics, the immediate post-1566 years when nonconformity first emerged openly, and the mid-1580s when the suspension of leading preachers and the influx

---

1. One of his more outstanding exploits was to preach for 2½ hours at St. Botolph Aldgate in February 1587 (GLMS. 9234/1, f.29r. (2nd.pt.)).

of prominent Scottish Presbyterians into the capital, created a highly inflammable situation resolved by Aylmer only by the severest disciplinary measures.

The chaotic conditions of 1566-8, with the fragmentation of nonconformity into small clandestine groups, worshipping within and without the established church, provoked the Lord Mayor to issue a precept, dated on June 28th, 1567,[1] and written upon the "...quens Majesties behalf,"[2] directing common councillors to summon their deputies, constables, and other ward officers before them. They were ordered to assist churchwardens to "...apprehend take and commit to warde all and everye suche misordered persone ... as shall Attempt ... to preche not having redie to be shewed furth good and sufficient lycence and Aucthoritie so to do grawnted and obteyned by wryting bering date upon or since..." March 1st, 1565, the date stipulated in the Advertisements. Four of the most persistent transgressors were named.[3] Offenders were to be held until further action was settled upon by Parker, Grindal and other Ecclesiastical Commissioners. While it was not uncommon for the secular arm in the City to be invoked in the quest for lay recusants,[4] this precept, evidently authorised by order of the Ecclesiastical

---

1. LCRO. Journals, 19, f.48r.
2. The non-survival of the A.P.C. for this date prevents a check on the source of the order.
3. William Martin, Nicholas Standen, John Browne and John Baron.
4. e.g. 1568 precept against absentees at church (LCRO. Journals, 19, f.106r.)

Commission, offers a rare example of the ecclesiastical authorities in London calling for secular reinforcement in the apprehension,- though not, it should be noted, in the subsequent judicial proceeding -, of members of the clergy. It reflects both the urgency of the problem, and the limitations of the existing apparatus of the Commission.[1] Six months later, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners endorsed the earlier regulation in an injunction issued probably to all City incumbents,[2] and recorded by one of the latter in his diary.[3] Incumbents were to acquaint the vestry men of the parish with the order, "... so as from time to time, at any alteration of church-wardens, they may have knowledge thereof, and the like charge given unto them." Evidently intended to be permanent, the injunction, according to Earl, was "...often Renwed/and also Imprynted",[4] and it remained in force until the dating requirements were revised by the 1571 canons.

Not until 1586 did a parallel situation, created largely by the infiltration into the capital of Scottish divines and

---

1. The Mayor's order of March 4th, 1568, for the detection of men who preached in private houses "...not being admytted to any suche mynystery or funcion", was directed against unordained separatists (LCRO. Rep 16, f.334r.).
2. Several of the surviving CWA. record the receipt of the injunction, e.g. GLMS 645/1, f.80r.; cf. The Accounts...of St. Michael Cornhill, ed. W.H.Overall, 235. The date of its issue was January 10th, 1568.
3. CUL. MS. Mm,1,29, ff.38v.-39r. It is printed by Strype (Grindal, 178), and is in Grindal's Remains, 293-4.
4. CUL. MS. Mm,1,29, f.39r. No contemporary printed copy has been found.

others suspended from their rural cures for nonconformity, necessitate similar emergency regulations for London. A citation against unlicensed preachers in the City was first drawn up by Aylmer in December, 1586, by virtue of his episcopal authority.[1] Introduced by a long preamble on the infiltration of preachers into London and the suburbs, some already suspended, and contemptuous of existing ecclesiastical laws, none possessing lawful authority to preach, it directed the apparitor-general and all "...clericis et literatis" whom it concerned, to take steps for the inhibition of all preachers in the City and suburbs who failed to produce authorised licences. Parish officials were instructed to inspect the credentials of visiting preachers or lecturers before admitting them to their pulpit.

The effect of the citation was evidently disappointing, for less than nine months later it was re-issued, in somewhat shortened form, as an injunction under the seal of the High Commission.[2] Not only did the signatures of Whitgift, Dale, Stanhope and Cosin, as well as that of Aylmer, endow the order with greater authority, but the bishop was now enabled to

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, 1,ff.132v.-133r. (December 27th, 1586). The document is in Latin.
2. Copies have been found in GLMS. 1432/3, f.30v.; and SP.11, 232. The latter is liberally annotated with abusive Puritan comment. Both copies are identical apart from the title, described as a commission in SP., and an injunction in the other. Its date of issue was August 16th, 1587.

transcend diocesan boundaries and extend his writ into the episcopally exempt enclaves in the City and liberties. Moreover, the terms of the injunction were more explicit, parish officials being charged to allow no visiting minister to preach or read lectures before they were shown to bear a licence from the Crown, a university, archbishop, or bishop of London. Copies of the injunction were to be delivered to all the London churches, a provision omitted in the earlier citation, and which undoubtedly enhanced the effectiveness of the order. Eighteen months later, on March 26th, 1589, the injunction was re-issued for the whole diocese;[1] for the most part its terms were identical, but it included an additional admonition against "... private assemblies or conventicles about Ecclesiastical exercyses...", and instructions that copies should be read out in parish churches on the Sunday following their receipt, and subsequently hung up in the church, with a copy written into the account books.[2] The injunction was signed by thirteen

---

1. Two copies have been traced, one in GLMS.1175/1 [no fol], the other in the vestry minutes of Stepney parish. The latter is printed in Memorials of Stepney Parish, ed. G.W.Hill and W.H. Frere (Guildford 1890-1), 20-21.
2. Several of the surviving CWA. record the purchase of the injunction, and of a frame in which to hang it, but a written copy has been found only in the books of St. Margaret New Fish St. (GLMS.1175/1 [no fol.]. The wardens of St. Alphage also obeyed the instruction, but perhaps confused by the welter of recent regulations, made a copy of the 1587 injunction (GLMS. 1432/3, f.30v.). Other copies are in the Stepney records, and in the Essex parish of Braintree. I am indebted to Dr. P. Collinson for the latter item.

members of the High Commission, including the five earlier signees.[1]

The story of the application of citation and injunctions belongs to the chapter on Puritan nonconformity in London; here, we have been concerned only with the apparatus of regulations drawn up during crucial phases in the struggle with nonconformity. Episcopal authority, effective enough in controlling the licensed preacher, by building up a network of conditions attached to the grant of a licence, and by periodical purges in the form of recalls and re-issues, was less adequate in regulating unauthorised preachers, who, not officially attached to the parochial unit, could not be reached by the normal visitatorial technique. The reinforcement of the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commission, with its powers to arrest and to cut across episcopal boundaries was found indispensable in the enclave-ridden ecclesiastical units that composed the City. In 1567, the limitations even of the Commissions' resources were exposed by its invocation of secular aid; the second major crisis in the mid-1580s was evidently overcome without recourse to such emergency measures.

(iii) THE NUMBER OF SERMONS

Minimum requirements were incorporated into the royal

---

1. The St. Margaret copy bears only 4 signatures. The 13 signees in the Stepney copy were Whitgift, Dale, Stanhope, Aubrey, Aylmer, Owen Hopton, William Lewyn, William Fleetwood, John Mullins, Bartholomew Clark, Cosin, and the bishops of Winchester and Hereford.

injunctions of 1559 from earlier usages.[1] Quarterly sermons were to be preached in every parish church by the parson or, if he were not authorised, by another.[2] Incumbents who were licensed preachers were to deliver sermons in their own cure, "...and every other cure they have" at least once every month.[3] Where no sermon was possible on a Sunday, the reading of officially prescribed homilies was instructed.[4] The imposition of a minimum of four sermons a year in every church was uniformly enforced, becoming an invariable feature of metropolitan and diocesan visitation articles and injunctions;[5] it was repeated in the Interpretations of 1560-1[6] and in the Advertisements,[7] though the former acknowledged that monthly sermons more closely approached the ideal. The minimum number of sermons required by licensed preachers rose during the reign; pluralists were expected to devote eight sermons annually at each of their two livings after the issue of Whitgift's orders in 1586,[8] while Archdeacon Mullins in his first visitation following their publication, laid down that all licensed

---

1. Compulsory quarterly sermons were laid down in the 2nd. royal injunctions of Henry VIII in 1538 (Frere, op.cit. ii,37).
2. No. IV (Card. Doc. Annals, i, 180-1.).
3. No. III (Ibid. 180).
4. No. IV (Ibid. 181).
5. e.g. Sandys' visitation articles, 1571 (Frere, op.cit. iii,305), Mullins' articles 1585 (W.P.M.Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, iii,175).
6. Frere, op.cit, iii, 59-60.
7. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 290-1.
8. Card. Synod, ii, 564.

preachers were to deliver at least sixteen sermons a year.[1] By 1604, standards had so improved again that the canons enjoined authorised preachers, resident on their livings, to preach every Sunday;[2] non-preachers were to procure others to deliver monthly sermons, "...if the living, in the judgement of the ordinary, will be able to bear it."[3]

Complaints of incumbents not exceeding the minimum requirements, or neglecting quarterly sermons altogether, were common,[4] and can be substantiated by presentments of defaulters recorded at episcopal and archdiaconal visitations.[5] An Essex rector, cited before the vicar-general of the diocese in 1561 for neglecting his cure, was ordered, inter alia, to "...cause duble sermons viz eight to be made in his church this yeare for default made thother yeares past."[6] Lord Keeper Egerton, revered by clerical beneficiaries for his zeal for a preaching ministry, on at least one occasion obliged a petitioner for a benefice to enter into a bond for the performance of twelve sermons annually;[7] possibly such bonds, as on the issue of preaching licences, were not uncommon on institution.

Such guarantees may not, however, have been needed for the

---

1. Kennedy, op.cit. iii, 240.
2. Card. Synod, i, 273 (No.XLV)
3. Ibid, 273 (No.XLVI)
4. SP. ii, 79.
5. cf. The Archdeacon's Court, ed. E.R.Brinkworth, Oxford Rec. Soc. 24 (1942), ll,viii-ix.
6. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Huick, f.41r.
7. Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.7r.

London ministry. Court proceedings following 'detecta' made at episcopal visitations, survive for 1583 and 1601, but only on one occasion was an incumbent presented for not fulfilling his minimum preaching duties. This was John Lownde, rector of St. Mary Staining, cited in 1601 for not preaching monthly sermons as required by the 1586 orders;[1] the explanation, that the living was too poor to bear the expense, appears justified when we consider that its official value was only £5. 6. 8.[2]. A few other pauperised benefices may have suffered in a similar fashion,[3] but their plight was hardly representative. The tributes of contemporaries to the extensive preaching that was practised in London have already been mentioned; its reputation was well enough known to be quoted by Grindal in his letter to the Queen, defending prophesyings as a means of increasing preaching.[4] Whitgift indeed at one time believed there was a superfluity of sermons in the City, leading to hasty productions that brought down standards, and he argued in favour of a maximum of one sermon per month.[5]

Parochial evidence confirms the contemporary impression of a flourishing state of preaching. Particularly fortunate were

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1601-2, f.24r.
2. V.E. i, 375.
3. The rector of St. Olave Hart St. was presented in the archdeacon's visitation of 1562 for neither preaching nor procuring another to preach the quarterly sermons (GL MS. 9055 [no fol.]).
4. Strype, Grindal, 562.
5. Works, iii, 1.

those parishes capable of sustaining lecturers. The growth and accelerating expansion post-1570 of the parish lectureship system is discussed elsewhere;[1] the preacher read lectures once, twice or thrice weekly, one of these occasions usually being on the Sunday. If the lecturer were an outsider, the incumbent occasionally reserved the Sunday pulpit for himself;[2] more frequently the parson delivered the lectures himself, and the quarterly and monthly sermons laid down by law were thereby included as part of his weekly expositions. The survival of what appears to be a unique set of parish documents, the memoranda books of the parish clerk of St. Botolph Aldgate, gives a revealing glimpse of everyday preaching activity in later Elizabethan London.[3] The parishioners[4] of St. Botolph, a perpetual curacy served by a non-preacher, were able to maintain at this time a virtually permanent outside lecturer, who was hired to preach twice weekly, - on the Sunday morning and Thursday evening -, as well as to catechise every Sunday afternoon. As the latter function was usually interpreted as an hour's exposition of the scriptures before the whole congregation rather than interrogation of individual children and servants as laid down in the royal injunctions, parishioners

---

1. Chapter VIII.
2. e.g. Wells, R. of St. Margaret Lothbury (GLMS. 4352/1,f.65v.)
3. GLMS. 9234/1-7. They cover the years December 1583 - Dec. 1584; Dec. 1586 - June 1600.
4. Robert Heax (P C. 1564-1594).

in fact had the opportunity to hear two sermons every Sunday as well as the additional weekday exposition. Taking 1588-89 as a sample,[1] between December 5th, 1588 and December 14th of the following year, forty-nine Sunday morning sermons were preached either by the lecturer, Christopher Threlkeld, or an appointed deputy; details of the three remaining Sundays are not given. On the Sabbath evening, forty-six expositions, variously described as sermons, lectures, exercises, or catechisms, but all apparently delivered to the whole congregation, were made during the year. The Thursday evening lecture was kept up for thirty-five weeks out of the fifty-two. Twenty-nine funeral sermons, all on weekdays, were preached in the parish during the year, while no opportunity was missed for celebrating a special date with a sermon, such as on Christmas Day, January 1st., the anniversary of the Queen's accession, and the defeat of the Armada; in all nine 'extra' sermons were delivered.

So long as a permanent lecturer resided on the parish, these remarkable figures were by no means exceptional. In the following twelve months, for instance, only on three Sunday mornings were no sermons preached, while an 'exercise' was recorded on forty-three Sunday evenings, and there were only five fewer Thursday lectures.[2] Similar figures were obtained

---

1. GLMS. 9234/2, ff.1r.-131v. passim.
2. GLMS. 9234/2, (2nd. pt.), passim.

for the next two years, but in 1594 the lecturer was appointed perpetual curate on the death of the previous incumbent. Evidently unable to serve the cure as well as maintain his earlier preaching record, Threlkeld abandoned the mid-week lecture, and cut down on his Sunday evening expositions, but he remained diligent in providing his parishioners with a weekly sermon on the morning of the Sabbath. The mid-week lecture was not revived before 1600, but Threlkeld's successors as parish lecturers, William Hubbock and Eusebius Paget, barely allowed one Sunday morning to pass without a sermon either by themselves or by deputies; the evening service, reduced by Hubbock to an interrogation of boys on points of the catechism,[1] was reconstructed by Paget into a full-scale sermon.[2]

The intense preaching activity at St. Botolph in this period may not, of course, have been typical of all the London parishes, but it was probably fairly representative of those which were in a position to maintain a lecturer to preach two or three times a week. Threlkeld's personal experience suggests that greater diligence in preaching could be expected if an outsider rather than the incumbent were engaged to read the lectures, if only because he was less preoccupied with other ministerial tasks.

---

1. GLMS. 9234/7, passim.
2. GLMS. 9234/5, passim.

Not all parishes could afford the luxury of lecturer;[1] in such cases the task of finding a preacher to fill the Sunday pulpit was more complicated. Whereas the engagement of a lecturer provided a ready-made solution to the preaching requirements laid down by the 1559 injunctions and Whitgift's orders of 1586, the less fortunate parishes were somewhat more casual in their arrangements. The provision of quarterly sermons was the responsibility of the parson;[2] if he were a non-resident, non-preacher, or impropriator,[3] he was required to appoint another to fill his place. Where the tithes were farmed out by the parson to the parish, the latter was charged with the provision and payment of four sermons a year.[4]

The financing of the monthly sermons obligatory for resident incumbents who were authorised preachers, on the other hand, issued out of the parish stock, and constituted a useful augmentation of the parson's income. The vestry men of St. Martin Orgar in 1595 agreed to allow their newly admitted incumbent £6 p.a. "...owt of the church stocke" for preaching every second Sunday in the parish.[5] Forty shillings a year was

---

-1. cf. Chapter VIII.
2. cf. Archdeacon Mullins' visitation articles 1587 enquired whether non-preaching parsons were taxed at 4 purchased sermons (Kennedy, op.cit.iii,240.
3. At St. Botolph Aldgate, a Crown impropriation, the farmer of the revenues appointed and paid for the sermons; being a local man, his choice usually fell on the parish lecturer. (e.g. GLMS. 9234/6, f.227r.).
4. e.g. St. Andrew Hubbard between 1558-68 (GLMS. 1279/2, ff.77r.-103v. passim).
5. GLMS. 959/1, f.69v.

granted to the rector of St. Alphage for delivering monthly sermons.[1] Such arrangements formed an economical substitute to the employment of a lecturer, and was probably a customary practice in the poorer parishes, who, while unable to set up a lectureship, maintained a preaching incumbent.

Non-preaching parsons, it was laid down in the 1604 canons, were to procure others to deliver monthly sermons "...if the living ... will be able to bear it."[2] Elizabethan practice in London appears to have been somewhat at variance with the canon, the cost of sermons being borne by the parish, not by the revenues of the benefice. At St. Alphage, where the rector was not an authorised preacher at the time, the church warden accounts from 1573 record the payment of sums of money - at 3/4 per sermon - to visiting preachers.[3] In the twelve months following Michaelmas 1573, there were no less than twenty-five sermons paid for in this way; an average of at least one sermon every other Sunday was highly creditable in a small parish, the living of which was officially rated at only £8 p.a.[4] Subsequently, the number was reduced to one a month, delivered by various City preachers, but by 1590 the church-wardens had found it more convenient to employ one preacher to deliver all

---

1. GLMS. 1432/3, f.35v. et seq.
2. Card. Synod, i, 273 (No.XLVI)
3. GLMS. 1432/2 [no fol.]
4. VE. i, 371.

twelve sermons at a wage of 40/- a year.[1] The number of annual sermons delivered at St. Martin Orgar rose from twelve in 1580 to seventeen in the following year, all of which were financed out of the church stock.[2] The average payment of 5/- a sermon may explain why the parish attracted rather better known preachers than St. Alphage.[3] In All Hallows Staining, served by a non-preaching perpetual curate, eighteen sermons were recorded in the twelve months following Michaelmas 1571, most of them preached by the neighbouring rector of All Hallows the Great.[4] At St. Benet Paul's Wharf in 1601, the quarterly as well as monthly sermons were contracted out to a preacher, hired for the purpose, presumably as a result of arrangements made between parson and parish.[5]

The cosmopolitan character of the capital, so often the sanctuary of the persecuted preacher, and the last refuge of the indigent itinerant, created ample opportunity for the casual sermon, the 'voluntary' exhortation in any available pulpit, for the unattached minister. These casual sermons, quite distinct from the regular series organised by parson and parish, usefully supplemented the latter; the appearance of a stray preacher, ready to make a sermon for no more than a

---

1. GLMS. 1432/3, f.35v.
2. GLMS. 959/1, f.46r.
3. They included leading Puritans such as Field, Barber, Cheston, and Charke.
4. GLMS. 4958/1, f.107r. and v.
5. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1601-2, f.15r.

benevolence, must have relieved many a City congregation, otherwise resigned to hear ~~the~~ a homily read by a non-preaching minister. The parish account books record numerous references to odd sermons given by such preachers, men with no official association with the London ministry, who were in the capital out of financial necessity, or in anticipation of preferment. The church wardens of St. George Botolph Lane in 1597 paid 6/8 to a preacher "...who had divers times pretched unto us gratis."[1] 3/4 was given in 1588 to "...a very poore prechar that dyd preache among us iii severall tymes by consent," by the wardens of St. Bartholomew the Less.[2] Records of such relief were significantly most frequent in the last twenty years of the reign when clerical supply approached saturation level in London.[3] University students were others to tour City parishes, offering their preaching services in return for small rewards. Ellis Goldwell, an Oxford scholar, was given 3/4 for preaching at St. Margaret Pattens in 1580;[4] seven years later, 'Mr. Griffin' of Trinity College, Cambridge, received 5/10 for two sermons in the same church.[5]

Funeral and commemorative sermons offered a further

---

1. GLMS. 951/1, f.9r.
2. St. Barts. Hosp. Rec. Office, The Book of Collections for the poor, f.37r.
3. cf. GLMS. 4409, ff.8v., 13v.; GLMS. 4352/1, ff.84v., 93r.
4. GLMS. 4570/2, p.135.
5. Ibid, p.170. The wardens of St. Mary Magdalene Milk St. in 1604 gave 5/- to a "...poor Scholler that preached in this Churche at the request of the bishop of London." (GLMS. 2596/1, f.234v.)

opportunity for the pious citizen to hear the word of God preached. Examination of contemporary testaments,- as of Machyn's diary -,shows that the practice of leaving a sum of money in a will for a funeral sermon was not unknown in the very early years of the reign;[1] later, it became the fashion, a possible successor to the pre-Reformation custom of bequeathing money to the 'high altar', among the lesser citizenry unable to leave substantial sums to preachers or to endow a lectureship or a divinity scholarship at a university. Too ostentatious a custom to be approved of by convinced Puritans,[2] citizens on occasion managed to reconcile these scruples with their desire for a memorial by stipulating that its function was "...the edification of the people there presente ... and for a gentle remembraunce."[3] Others were concerned only with its didactic purpose, that "...the people ... may learne to lyve in the fear of god And prepare and make themselves reddy to die when soever god shall call for them as he will do me before them."[4] Whatever their motives, their popularity, especially in the second half of the reign, was unquestioned; at St. Botolph Aldgate, 20-30 funeral sermons

---

1. The earliest in the Elizabethan archdiaconal testamentary registers was in August 1560 (GLMS. 9051/3, f.4v.)
2. For Cartwright's condemnation of funeral sermons, cf. A.F. Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism (1925), 94.
3. Commissory Ct. Reg., GLMS. 9171/16, f.148v.
4. Ibid, f.396v.

were preached annually between 1586-1597.[1] Only London, with its unique population and mortality figures, could create opportunities for sermons on such a scale, opportunities which doubtless neither congregation nor preacher, - to whom they formed a valuable additional sourde of income[2] -, failed to appreciate.

(iv) PAUL'S CROSS

No picture of preaching activity in Elizabethan London would be complete without reference to the sermons at Paul's Cross. Established as an unrivalled preaching platform a century before the Reformation,[3] the controversies of the Edwardian and Marian period on several occasions found violent expression in disturbances at the Cross.[4] The controversial character of its sermons, delivered to a critical and often hostile audience, was maintained during Elizabeth's reign. According to Thomas Drant, those who disapproved of the preacher's remarks, "...will dissemble their revengement before the eyes of the world; but when the preacher is gone out of the pulpit they will set upon him."[5] Others wrote their comments on slips which were passed to the preacher; Bishop

---

1. Memo Bks., GLMS. 9234/1-7, passim.
2. Legacies for a funeral sermon were often as much as 6/8, somewhat higher than the normal market price which varied between 3/6 and 5/-.
3. M.A. Cornford, Paul's Cross: A History (1910), 29.
4. cf. J.O.W.Haweis, Sketches of The Reformation And Elizabethan Age (1844), 36.
5. Ibid. 38.

Alley in 1565 found it necessary to apologise for publishing his lectures in the Poor Mans Library without "an...answer to certain railing bills cast into the preaching place against him, by certain chattering choughs."[1] John Dove's criticism of Beza's views on divorce at the end of the reign brought so much abuse upon his head from those to whom Beza's "... authoritie is ... more canonicall then the canonicall scriptures, that he was obliged to include a prefatory apology to the sermon on its publication.[2]

Passions were doubtless difficult to control among an audience that Bishop Jewel in 1560 estimated as sometimes amounting to 6,000 persons, "...old and young, of both sexes."[3] Jewel was deeply impressed by their religiosity, "...all singing together and praising God," but later in the reign preachers at the Cross were apt to complain of the "... accustomed walking and profane talking in time of the sermon there;"[4] Francis Marbury, preaching in 1602, compared the attendance of some with "...the piller-prayers of manie whiche kneele downe only for fashions sake."[5] Fashion, the desire to mingle in an audience that included the civic dignitaries, and,

---

1. Ibid. 38.
2. J. Dove, Of Divorcement. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, (1601), f.1r.
3. Zurich Letters, ed. H.Robinson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1842), 1,71.
4. A. Anderson, A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1581), f.1r.
5. A Sermon Preached at Pauls X (1602), f.1r.

in time of Parliament, figures of even greater eminence, may well have swelled attendances, but Londoners, particularly parishioners whose incumbent was a non-preacher, were actively encouraged to go to Paul's Cross. An order, unfortunately undated, but known to be pre-1579, instructed curates to end their services by 9 a.m. on Sundays so that they and their parishioners could hear the preachers at the Cross.[1] A similar order was made in Aylmer's visitation injunctions of 1583.[2]

Despite the glamour of Paul's Cross, the opportunity of fame, or at least of attracting the favours of an influential patron, episcopal complaints of the difficulty of filling the pulpit were recurrent from the time of Henry VIII onwards; Bonner and Ridley found equal difficulty in supplying learned men, both appealing for aid to Parker, at that time Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge.[3] The survival of a fairly complete record of weekly sermons preached at the Cross in 1565-6,[4] suggests that the problem was less acute in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, but it constituted a constant worry to

---

1. Cornford, op.cit. 30. Sermons at the Cross began at 10 a.m., according to a contemporary witness; William Stepney, The Spanish Schoole-master (1591), 125. Stepney gives an amusing picture of the scene (124-130).
2. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, vi, f.35v.
3. Haweis, op.cit. 49-50.
4. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10, f.18r. et seq. The high proportion of radicals among the pre-1566 preachers at the Cross is discussed in Chapter X.

Aylmer during his episcopacy. Preachers may have been reluctant to expose themselves to a critical audience, with the risk of tarnishing their popular reputation,[1] but the principal reasons for the shortage lay without doubt in the manner of appointment and the inadequate remuneration.

Traditionally, the right of appointment lay with the bishop of London, but the City authorities appear in Edward VI's reign to have exploited the curtailment of Bonner's powers by claiming some share in the nomination.[2] By the Elizabethan period, the situation was quite confused, and Grindal was hardly the man to re-assert episcopal authority. The Lord Mayor, bishop, and the Earl of Leicester were all said to have made appointments immediately before 1566.[3] The association of several of the preachers with nonconformity in the vestiarian controversy drove the archbishop to take drastic steps, vetting candidates and rejecting those regarded as less than strictly orthodox.[4] Episcopal authority was still inconclusive in 1573 when Sandys allowed prominent nonconformists to use the platform,[5] but was quickly re-established by Aylmer. "Everie sonday throughe the yeare in the forenoone," he declared in 1594[6] "...yt hathe time

---

1. Stephen Gosson in 1598 recalled how he had been told, after preaching at the Cross, "...to my head fortie miles hence...that I had stricken at some great person and should be called in question for it." (The Trumpet of Warre, (1598), p.96.).
2. Cornford, op.cit. 40.
3. Parker's Correspondence, 239.
4. Parker, Corr. 239.
5. Cornford, op.cit. 70-1.
6. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, ii, f.164r. (March 7th, 1594).

owt of minde or memorie of man bene verie laudable accustomed that ... a sermon by some godlye and learned preacher should be made at the preachinge place called Paules crosse in London and that the person to perform the same hath by like continuance bene usuallie called named appointed and *inioyned* by the bishoppe of London..."

Despite Aylmer's re-assertion of episcopal rights, appointments proved no easier to make.[1] The debarring of known nonconformists from the pulpit reduced the supply of potential Paul's Cross preachers; others may have reacted against Aylmer's tendency to exploit the pulpit for propaganda purposes.[2] Sermons that condemned faction and schism were likely to find their way into print with the sanction of the bishop; Robert Temple, for instance, whose sermon at the Cross in 1592 was an eloquent plea for unity, dedicated the printed version to Aylmer, as it was published "...according to your Lord's pleasure."[3] Not all preachers, perhaps, were prepared to harness their independence to episcopal favour.

The basic difficulty, however, was financial, the inadequacy of existing funds to provide a remuneration that

---

1. e.g. Aylmer complained in the 1586 Convocation that the dean of Norwich and others had failed to preach at Paul's Cross when admonished (Strype, Aylmer, 201).
2. Aylmer was not of course the first to exploit the publicity value of Paul's Cross in this way (cf. Haweis, op.cit, 49.)
3. A Sermon ... Preached at Paules Cross (1592), f.1r.

would attract leading university preachers. According to Newcourt,[1] preachers had £2.5.0 plus four days board and lodging, but this seems extremely unlikely for the Elizabethan period. William Fisher, whose chaplaincy to Aylmer gave his words an official air, appealed in 1591 for a grant of £52 a year from the City to cover the expenses of preachers.[2] University preachers, he declared, "...are faine to come at their owne greate coste and charge, which cannot stand with their poore and small abilitye;" consequently, they "...are not more often sent for, then commonly they refuse to come."[3] Despite his plea that the City, so liberal in supplying schools, hospitals and conduits, might help to supply "...the Waters of Life," Fisher's appeal apparently met with no success, the City government maintaining its characteristic conservative reputation in matters of finance.

Aylmer tried coercive measures. He had early in his episopacy delegated the task of finding and contracting preachers to a chaplain, William Cotton,[4] and had insured against possible defections by arranging with a local clergyman that "whensoever need shalbe he will supplie the place of preachinge at Powles cross upon anie defecte when warninge

---

1. Newcourt, i, 5.
2. A Godly Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1592), f.3r.
3. Ibid, f.1r.
4. Addit. MS. 32092, f.140r.

shalbe gyven him thereto..."[1] Later, bonds were entered for the performance of these duties.[2] Despite his precautions, the position had gravely deteriorated by 1591, the year of Fisher's appeal for funds. Aylmer ultimately sought the advice of the privy council, complaining that not "...twoe amongst tenne of them that be soe sent for, eyther orderly to answere our letteres in tyme convenient ... or to show any reverend duty to the place or solemnitye of the service there."[3] Cotton, "... growing nowe at ease in Samaria", had disclaimed the responsibility, forgetting his prdmise "...to mee, who have bene his setter up."[4] The remedy was to set up some penalty for such defaults, either by strengthening the Ecclesiastical Commission or by the special authority of the privy council "...in her Majestie's name."

The council at once referred the matter to Whitgift.[5] His reaction is not known, but he may have had some part in the new arrangements introduced by Aylmer a year later. In March

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, i, f.144r. (1586). The clergyman appointed was Anthony Anderson, on his institution to the vicarage of Stepney. Anderson was involved in a dispute with John Duffield over the presentation to the living (ibid. f.143v.); his willingness to help out Aylmer may have swayed the bishop's decision in his favour.
2. Ibid. ii, f.63v. (1591). The duties by this time had devolved on John Duport.
3. Addit. MS. 32092, f.140r. (December 23rd, 1592).
4. Aylmer had made Cotton a domestic chaplain, had collated him to the lucrative rectory of St. Margaret New Fish St., and obtained for him the archdeaconry of Lewes. Cotton later became bishop of Exeter.
5. Addit. MS. 32092, f.141r. (December 26th, 1592); A.P.C.xxiii, 383-4.

1594, a constitution was made "...for the byndinge of the prebendarie of harlestone ... for the supplieng of the wante of preachers at Powles Crosse."[1] The prebend, attached to St. Paul's cathedral, was in the collation of the bishop of London.[2] The prebendary was bound both to perform secretarial duties, sending the bishop's letters of request to candidates and conveying their replies, and to supply a vacancy at the Cross either by preaching there himself or by appointing a deputy.

The constitution was intended to endure only during Aylmer's life time, but may have been renewed by his successors. Complaints of neglect appear to have abated towards the close of the century, possibly owing to Aylmer's constitution or to the instructions made by Fletcher on his accession that his archdeacons note down the "...speciall men within your precinct as are able to furnish the preachinge at Powlls crosse, the more principale for the terme, the second sorte for non terminus."[3] Chiefly responsible for the apparent revival, however, was the £300 left by Aylmer for the maintenance of the Paul's Cross sermons, to which was added the £100 left for Aylmer's disposal by Elizabeth, Countess of Shrewsbury.[4] The

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, ii, ff.163v.-164v.
2. It was valued at £11. 2. 3½ (V.E. i,364).
3. Herts. Rec. Office, Miscellaneous Papers 1582-1600, Box F, Bundle A, 200. (January 2nd, 1595).
4. Newcourt, i, 5.

legacy formed a fitting climax to the bishop's efforts to uphold the century-old reputation of Paul's Cross, somewhat tarnished by the effects of the inadequate remuneration of recent days, and to his life-long concern for a preaching ministry, first confessed in his Harborowe for the Faithful.[1]

---

1. Strype, Aylmer, 148.

CHAPTER FIVE

NON-RESIDENCE AND PLURALISM.

The ideal of a single-beneficed ministry formed the third of the triple pillars of Puritan advocacy in the Elizabethan period.[1] It was the most basic and at the same time the least realistic point of radical compaigning; fundamental because the ideals of an educated and a preaching ministry were both dependent for their successful execution on the residence of the pastor among his parishioners; unrealistic because the state of ecclesiastical income and the flow of clerical supply made its application impossible under existing conditions. Impractical as it appeared to the church authorities, conscious that ministerial recruitment of university luminaries depended on the existence of "...extraordinary reward for extraordinary virtue,"[2] the image of the faithful pastor, resident on his cure and continuously ministering to his hungry flock the spiritual food indispensable for salvation, was powerful enough not only among the Puritan propagandist, but among the least partisan parishioners aware of the consequences of

---

1. cf. John Nash's assertion that for "...one man to have two benefytes or manye at once is as unlawfull as for one man to have two or manye wyves at once..." for an extreme Puritan attitude (S.P. i, 151)
2. This was a typical episcopal apologia (Card. Doc. Annals, ii,15.).

pluralism and its concomitant abuse, non-residence, to make this issue the most topical and controversial of ecclesiastical debates.

(i) NON-RESIDENCE

All incumbents were required by canon and statutory law to reside on their livings unless otherwise dispensed, vicars swearing on oath to do so on their institution.[1] According to the statute of 21 Henry VIII, residence implied occupation of the parsonage or vicarage house attached to the benefice; residence elsewhere within the same parish was liable to prosecution unless the alienation or decay of the parsonage made it unavoidable.[2] A statute of 13 Elizabeth supplemented that of 1530 by specifying the maximum period of absenteeism from his cure of a single-beneficed man, not otherwise dispensed, as eighty days in the year;[3] this became the standard criterion in subsequent ecclesiastical proceedings against non-residents.[4]

Apart from those authorised to hold in plurality, dispensations for non-residence were available for a variety of clerical categories, from scholars studying in universities to chaplains, and prebendaries of cathedrals;[5] temporary

---

1. Burn, iii, 316.
2. Statutes of the Realm (1817), iii,294 (21 Henry VIII, c.13).
3. Ibid. iv.556. (13 El. c.20).
4. e.g. the revenues of the rectory of Gedlestone in Herts. were sequestered in 1582 because the incumbent had absented himself from his cure for over 80 days in the year (LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.292r.).
5. Statutes, iii, 295.

faculties could also be obtained on the grounds of illness or the non-availability of the parsonage.[1] While the exemption of household chaplains, either of ecclesiastical or secular dignitaries, remained unregulated, other categories found it increasingly more difficult to claim a dispensation during the course of Elizabeth's reign. The raising of the minimum age of entry into the ministry and the curtailing of the faculty de non promovendo,[2] reduced the number of scholars in possession of benefices; prebendaries, - with the exception of canons residentiary -, were required by the canons of 1597 and 1604 to reside on their own livings for at least eleven months of the year "...unless it be for some urgent cause, and certain time to be allowed by the bishop of the diocese."[3]

Excluding clergymen absent from their cures by virtue of the chaplaincies they held, dispensations for non-residence, it appears, were by the later part of the Elizabethan period confined to emergency cases. Only one such faculty, it was claimed in an episcopal declaration of 1584, had been granted since Whitgift's accession, and that to a man eighty years of age.[4] Of the handful of grants found in the London diocesan

---

1. The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. W.Nicholson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge, 1843), 294-5.
2. Card. Doc. Annals, ii, 15. The words 'de non residendo' are obviously a misprint for 'de non promovendo'. cf. Correspondence of Matthew Parker, ed. J.Bruce, Parker Soc. (Cambridge,1853),13
3. Card. Synod, i,150-1, 272-3.
4. Card. Doc. Annals, ii, 15. cf. Fortescue's speech in the 1589 Parliament (J.E.Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1584-1601 (1957), 226).

records, one authorised a sick City incumbent to spend a year's convalescence in Bath,[1] and another was due to the lease of the vicarage house to a layman.[2]

The penalty, both by canon and statutory law, for unauthorised non-residence was extremely severe. Persistent absenteeism was accepted in canon law as a form of desertion, liable to the sequestration of the revenues of the benefice, and ultimately deprivation.[3] By the statute of 21 Henry VIII, a fine of £10 a month was to be imposed on non-residents, half of which was to fall to the Crown, the remainder to the informer.[4] Leases of the income of the living by non-residents were cancelled by a statute of 1571;[5] five years later, a further statute enacted that if the bishop did not sequester the fruits of a non-resident incumbent, parishioners might withhold payment of tithes.[6] The monthly fine, according to an episcopal report of 1584, constituted an effective deterrent against potential absentees, being enforceable notwithstanding the holding of a faculty de non residendo.[7]

Special factors attended on the problem of non-residence among single-beneficed London clergymen. From one point of

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.183v.
2. Ibid. Stanhope, ii, f.40v.
3. Burn, iii, 340.
4. Statutes of the Realm, iii, 295. (21 H.VIII, c.13).
5. An exception was made of a lease to the curate, if resident (Ibid. iv, 556 (13 El. c.20.).
6. Ibid, iv, 623 (18 El. c.11).
7. Card. Doc. Annals, ii, 15.

view, the possession of a living in the capital improved the prospects of his residence. A frequent complaint against rural incumbents was their absence in London,[1] perhaps in search of patronage, or for a less laborious form of livelihood than a pastoral charge, or perhaps in the service of a nobleman up in town for the season. City incumbents were not so distracted by these temptations, even chaplains often finding it possible to reside fairly continuously in their parishes.[2] The proximity of the diocesan cathedral to the parishes enabled prebendaries of St. Paul's who held City livings, to reside on the latter even before the revised regulations of 1597 came into force.[3] The attractions of London to the aspiring clergymen, the prospects of patronage and the opportunities for lucrative forms of by-employment, were likewise incentives to residence. Again, it may be argued, the higher academic standards of the City ministry may have given the relatively few graduates who held only one benefice an added sense of responsibility that obliged them to residence. This vocational

---

1. cf. the 1561 Report on London, where several assistant curates, resident in London, are recorded as beneficed in the country. e.g. Thomas Mitchell, curate of St. Stephen Walbrook, had a living in Chichester diocese, John Markant, curate of St. Dunstan in West, was R. of Clacton Magna in Essex (Mullins,270, 281).
2. e.g. William Cotton, chaplain to Aylmer, frequently attended the vestry meetings in his parish of St. Margaret New Fish St. (GLMS. 1175/1 [no fol.]).
3. e.g. Edward Leyfield, rector of St. Peter le Poer 1575-83, also held the prebendal stall of Holborn at St. Paul's (Henn.29) His residence in London also enabled him to take up various lecturing appointments (cf. GLMS.9537/5 [no fol.] sub St. Clement Eastcheap and St. Michael Cornhill

commitment to share actively in the daily welfare of parishioners was certainly evident among those Puritan-minded incumbents who aspired to the ideal of a faithful pastor in the later part of the reign, of whom the careers of Thomas White, vicar of St. Dunstan in the West,[1] and Andrew Castleton, rector of St. Martin Pomeroy,[2] offer striking illustrations. A further effective inducement in those parishes where the parishioners exerted some influence in the placing and displacing of their minister, lay in the strongly-felt desire of the citizens for a resident minister. The extent of this pressure is brought out to us by the enforced resignation of Henry Bedell from his vicarage of Christ Church in 1576 after repeated complaints of his non-residence by the parishioners to the governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, the impropriate rectors.[3]

Secular pressure of this kind was most possible in the impropriated livings where citizens either held the advowson or were accustomed to advise the patron in his nomination. In more orthodox benefices, however, parishioners were equipped to take action against illegitimate absenteeism by suing the ordinary for a writ of sequestration. By virtue of this writ,

---

1. White did, however, permit himself a canonry at St. Paul's. (Henn. 38).
2. He was one of the few City incumbents singled out in the Puritan Survey of 1586 for pastoral devotion. (SP.ii,95,note 4).
3. St. Barts. Hosp. Rec. Office, Ha 1/2, ff.125v.-130v. passim. At St. Margaret Lothbury, two incumbents sought the permission of the vestry before a temporary absence (GLMS. 4352/1, f.25v., f.101v.).

authority was given by the bishop, who alone among the diocesan administrators was empowered to make the grant,[1] to certain individuals in the parish concerned, - usually the church wardens on occasion the minister appointed to serve the cure -, to sequester the fruits of the benefice for the use of the succeeding incumbent.

The sequestration records survive almost *in toto* for Elizabethan London.[2] Only on one occasion was neglect in providing for the cure given as the grounds for sequestration;[3] four other parsons found their revenues alienated following their unofficial desertion,[4] that is, their departure without obtaining the deeds that would have validated their resignation.[5] The sequestration of a further benefice "...*ratione dilapidation et ruine ... Rectorii edificiorum et mansionarum eiusdem Ecclie*",[6] may have been attributable to the poverty as much as the negligence of the incumbent. Most of these cases occurred

---

1. Burn, iii, 340.
2. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. *passim*. There is a gap in 1599 and part of 1600.
3. *Ibid*. Hamond, f.40r. The incumbent was George Barton, rector of St. Swithin 15 ? -1561.
4. John Owgan (R. of St. Olave Silver St., seq. est. 1562; R. of St. Mary Staining, seq. 1562); Thomas Longe (R. of St. Margaret Moses, seq. 1573); Peter White (R. of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey, seq. 1575), and Thomas Lloyd (R. of St. Mary Mounthaw, seq. 1588).
5. For resignation deeds, cf. Kathleen Major, Resignation Deeds of the Diocese of Lincoln, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, xix, (1942-3), 57-65.
6. This was St. Thomas Apostle; incumbent Ralph Bentley, seq. 1568. The living was worth £12 in the Queen's Books (*VE*. i,372)

before 1570, the majority probably being pre-Elizabethan ordinands,[1] reared in a tradition less exacting in its demands for a resident ministry, - for the Protestant emphasis on preaching brought with it a new attitude towards clerical residence. A second mitigating factor was the poverty of most of these sequestered livings: St. Olave Silver Street was officially valued at only £7. 7. 11, St. Mary Mounthaw at £6. 10s., St. Mary Staining at 106/8, while St. Thomas Apostle was worth £12 in 1535.[2] Not all the absentees can be thus whitewashed, - the sequestered livings of St. Margaret Moses and St. Swithin were both over £15 in value,[3] - but in the poorest parishes, the prohibitive expenditure involved by continuous residence may explain the absenteeism of the incumbent. Others in similar circumstances relieved their difficulties by holding in plurality.

The rarity with which parishioners sued for a sequestration on account of the absenteeism of their incumbent does not suggest that the abuse flourished in London. The infrequency of judicial proceedings against unauthorised non-residents tends to confirm this impression. Enquiries of this kind formed a regular feature of visitations, archdiaconal and

---

1. No ordination details are available, but their earlier careers suggest that Barton, Bentley, Owgan, and possibly Longe were pre-1559 ordinands.
2. V.E. i, 372-5.
3. Ibid. 371,372.

episcopal; in the only surviving archdeaconery court act book, which includes the detecta made at Mullins' visitation of January, 1563, only one incumbent, the rector of St. Margaret Pattens, was required to certify of his residence.[1] In the episcopal visitation of 1583, Arthur Williams, rector of St. Andrew Wardrobe, was detected for failing to appear in his parish three months after his institution;[2] in 1592, James Taylor received a citation to reside on his benefice of St. Andrew Hubbard.[3] Otherwise, the surviving visitation records, while furnishing information on non-residence among pluralists, give no indication of absenteeism by single-beneficed clergymen.

Ultimately, illicit non-residence was liable to ecclesiastical censure culminating in deprivation. A few cases were dealt with in the London consistory court, brought about either on the initiative of parishioners who presumably found a sequestration inadequate to bring about the removal of an absentee parson, - for the writ was perforce revoked if the incumbent decided to return -, or by the ordinary by the process ex officio mero.[4] Four such actions are known to have

---

1. GLMS. 9055 [no fol.].
2. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, iv, f.24r.
3. GLMS. 9537/8, f.82v.
4. This was a type of case where the judge acted by virtue of his own office. Most criminal cases were dealt with in this way, as were visitation detecta et comperta. Proceedings were usually summary, by word of mouth. (cf. B.L.Woodcock, Medieval Ecclesiastical Courts in The Diocese of Canterbury (1952), 68-71.).

taken place during the course of the reign, while the deprivation of George Barton from his rectory of St. Swithin in 1561 may also have been due to his absenteeism.[1] Robert Ferme, rector of St. Ethelburgh, and described in 1560 as a non-resident "...nec concionatur neque fovet alimentum sed percipit fructus beneficii..."[2], was proceeded against in 1567,[3] but managed to retain his living until his death in 1569.[4] Less fortunate was the fate of Edward Turner, deprived in 1569 for absenteeism from his rectory of St. Botolph Bishopsgate,[5] a living worth £20 in the Queen's books. Sentence of deprivation was pronounced against Richard Beard, rector of St. Mary Hill, in the consistory court on February 22nd, 1574, despite the claim of the defending proctor that Beard was legally dispensed to be absent "...causa studii in universitate Oxoniensi...".[6]

---

1. The court records are missing for that year. His later indictment for immorality suggests, however, that Barton's deprivation may have been due to other factors (cf. Stowe's Memoranda, in Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles, ed. J.Gairdner, Camden Soc. (1880), 127).
2. Mullins, 261.
3. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1565-9, f.180r.
4. Henn. 152.
5. There is no record in this case in the Liber Actorum, but a copy of final sentence of deprivation survives in a precedent book of cases taken from the consistory court. (Bodl. MS. Rawlinson D 1007, f.76r. and v.).
6. The Liber Actorum for this date is missing, but a copy of the proceedings was recorded in the archbishop's register (Registrum Matthei Parker, ed. W.H.Frere (Oxford 1933), iii, 1113-4.).

The most protracted action was that commenced against Anthony Silliard, vicar of St. Mary Islington, in 1576, and continued intermittently for the next six years. On his initial non-appearance in court, order was taken for the sequestration of his fruits,[1] but this does not appear to have been put into effect.[2] In 1578, judicial negotiations, undertaken ex officio mero, for his deprivation were started.[3] Silliard appeared, and claimed he was legally dispensed from residence according to the terms of Henry VIII's statute, by virtue of his position as domestic chaplain to Roger Manwood, a judge of the Queen's Bench. His defence was strong enough to cause the negotiations for his deprivation to be abandoned, and the action ended with no severer judicial censure than an admonition to reside personally according to the oath he made on his institution.[4] Four months later, Silliard temporarily insured himself against further suits of this kind by obtaining a toleration de non residendo from Aylmer, authorising him on account of sickness to absent himself for a year, so long as a suitable minister was provided to serve the cure, so that he could partake of the waters of Bath for a cure.[5] In 1581 he

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1575-7 [no fol.].
2. There is no record of the issue of the sequestration.
3. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1579-81, ff.28r.-29v.
4. Ibid. f.44v.
5. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Hamond, f.183v.

enhanced his hold on the living by entering priest's orders, without which no presentation was legally valid,[1] and continued as vicar until his death two years later.[2]

It may be argued, therefore, from the rarity of sequestrations or judicial proceedings against absenteeism that non-residence among single-beneficed clergymen was hardly an acute abuse in London, particularly as it was quite possible for parishioners to take action against an absent incumbent by suing for a sequestration, by presentment at a visitation, or by commencing judicial proceedings ex officio promoto.[3] Citizens would surely have not indulged so infrequently in such remedies had the abuse flourished. Despite its condemnation of clerical standards in the capital, the Puritan Survey of 1586 confirms this impression, for of the forty-one incumbents within the archdeaconry who were described as single-beneficed, only one was said to be non-resident.[4]

A by-product of the issue was the technical point of residence within the parsonage house in the same parish, a requirement laid down, in the view of the ecclesiastical

---

1. He had served as vicar for 15 years in minor orders.
2. Henn. 230.
3. i.e. a form of action whereby the judge undertook the prosecution of a person at the 'promotion' of a third party. It was popular with parishioners attempting to remedy the faults of their parson, e.g. Wardens of St. Katherine Cree v. the curate 1579 (Lib. Act. 1579-81, f.102r.).
4. SP. ii, 181. He was Thomas Browne, of St. Benet Finck.

lawyers, Gibson and Burn, by the statute of Henry VIII.[1] No question of absence of pastoral care was involved, as ministerial diligence was hardly dependent on his choice of dwelling house within the parish; indeed, the intention appears simply to have been to safeguard the parsonage from ruin. The point, however, was of some significance in London where daily pastoral service could be reconciled with residence in any part of the city, so closely integrated were the parishes. Moreover, a number of parsonage houses had either been alienated or become uninhabitable through neglect by the Elizabethan period; no figures are available before 1638, but in that year at least ten incumbents were obliged to rent a house or to reside out of London in the absence or non-availability of the parsonage.[2]

It is extremely doubtful whether judicial proceedings for non-residence were actually commenced against incumbents who resided elsewhere in the City than in their own parishes, but there is evidence to suggest that the matter caused some concern to London parsons. In their petition to Convocation in 1581, they pleaded that "...Because most of the parsonage howses in London are now in citizen's hands and unrecoverable, we humbly require that such clergiemen as have no parsonage

---

1. Burn, iii, 300-1.
2. Dale; 12, 59, 61, 77, 100, 135, 113, 137, 140, 151.

howses, and not convenient howses, if they dwell in any place of the citie, it may be interpreted for them as a residence."[1]

Later in the reign, Samuel Proctor, vicar of St. Mary Islington, found it discreet to apply for a toleration de non residendo, as the vicarage house had been leased out by a predecessor to a layman.[2] Aylmer granted the dispensation on the condition that he resided within the City at a distance of no more than a mile from Islington, and that a suitable minister was appointed to minister to the sick in the parish. This may, however, have been a special case, as vicars were bound by oath to reside; it is the only faculty of its kind discovered in the London records.

In a few parishes, the problem was solved by a settlement or a legacy providing funds for a new parsonage house. Two parishioners of St. James Garlickhithe assigned £40 to the church wardens for a dwelling house for the incumbent; further donations amounting to £80 were made by various citizens including Sir Edward Osborne, to which was added £40 out of the church stock. The total sum of £160 was used in 1589 to purchase a messuage in the parish, for the exclusive use of the parson, and no part of which to be let out.[3] This transaction throws much light on the emphasis laid by citizens

---

1. J. Collier, An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (1852), ix, 344.
2. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, ii, f.40v.
3. Endowed Charities (County of London), (1897), vi, 305.

on a resident incumbent, as does the concession made by the parishioners of Holy Trinity Less to reduce the rent of the fector's dwelling house, a tenement owned by the parish, by a third so long as he remained resident on his benefice.[1]

We may conclude that the problem of absenteeism among single-beneficed clergymen, with its attendant abuses of neglect of the cure, was neither acute nor measureably deleterious in Elizabethan London, although technical non-residence due to the alienation of parsonages, caused some anxiety to contemporaries. The reasons may have lain in the superior academic, and consequently, often vocational qualities of the London clergy, the pressure exerted by laymen for their residence, the disciplinary measures available against defaulters, and above all, in the advantages accruing from residence in a city that offered so varied opportunities to an aspiring cleric.

(ii) PLURALISM

A more actual problem was that produced by the extensive practice of pluralism flourishing in the ministry. The most diligent parson enjoying two livings, could devote only part of his time to each; at other times, the spiritual welfare of parishioners was entrusted to the charge of a curate only to a degree less variable in quality in the capital than elsewhere.

---

1. GLMS. 4835/1, f.24r. (1590-1).

Neglect of the cure arising from an unsatisfactory substitute, the leasing of the rectorial revenues to laymen unscrupulous in litigating against tithe defaulters, the ruin or alienation of the parsonage, were all possible consequences of absenteeism owing to pluralism.

Despite its intention, the Henrician act,[1] which governed the regulations concerning pluralities for the next two centuries, had not substantially reduced the practice. It had put limitations on the maximum number of benefices that could simultaneously be held,[2] had struck against unauthorised pluralism in livings worth £8 or over, and had to a certain extent related dispensations to academic ability by specifying the clerical grades eligible for such tolerations. By allowing graduates in divinity or law the right to hold in plurality, it put a premium on academic qualifications that was to provide the Elizabethan ecclesiastical authorities with a major advertisement to attract university men into the church. On the other hand, the over-anxiety of the Henrician legislators to satisfy influential social factions by making concessions to chaplains attached to men of the rank of knight and upwards, lent itself to much subsequent abuse. Not only did it qualify clergymen, often of no apparent distinction, to hold in

---

1. 21 Henry VIII c. 13 (Statutes, iii, 292-6).
2. A maximum of four was laid down (ibid. 294).

plurality, but it tended to make a chaplaincy an excuse to obtain a dispensation. An indication of the liabilities involved in the Henrician statute is given by the petition for its repeal made in 1554 by the lower house of convocation on the grounds that it authorised "...a great multitude of priests and chaplleyns to be absent from their benefices with cure, than was ever permitted by the canon laws..."[1] Persistent complaints of this kind were made later by the Puritans who suggested minimum academic qualifications to hold a chaplaincy,[2] but no action was taken, partly no doubt on account of the indispensable administrative services performed by chaplains in archiepiscopal and episcopal households.

In other respects, Elizabethan statutory and canon laws did attempt to mitigate the adverse consequences of pluralism Acts in 1571 and 1576 struck against pluralists who let out the fruits of their non-resident living to laymen, by imposing heavy fines as well as the threat of ecclesiastical censure on non-residents who made such transactions.[3] The 1571 canons laid down that no more than two benefices could be simultaneously held,[4] a maximum strictly adhered to, according to Whitgift.[5] A maximum distance of twenty-six miles between each benefice

---

1. Card. Synod. ii,435.
2. Card. Doc. Annals, ii, 18.
3. 13 El. c. 20; 18 El. c. 11 (Statutes, iv, 556, 623).
4. Card. Synod, i, 128.
5. Strype, Whitgift, iii, 171.

was imposed in 1571,[1] being raised to thirty miles in 1585 and 1604, and exhortations were made for the residence of the parson in each living for a good part of the year.[2] Most important were the increasingly stringent provisions concerning a curate in the non-resident cure; the minimum demand in the early part of the reign that the living should be adequately furnished,[3] gave way by 1604 to the stipulation that the parson "...have under him in the benefice, where he doth not reside, a preacher lawfully allowed, that is able sufficiently to teach and instruct the people."[4]

Sustained Puritan Parliamentary pressure was as much responsible as the higher standards of ecclesiastical policy made possible by the improved university recruitment, for these several improvements,[5] but the basic Puritan premise of a single-beneficed, resident ministry, was repeatedly and consistently thwarted on the grounds of legitimacy as well as policy. Tighter control over dispensations was accepted in 1585 when Convocation laid down minimum qualifications of a master's degree in arts as well as a preaching licence,[6] but attempts at their abolition were rejected by arguments that varied little from one Parliament to the next. The bill

---

1. Card. Synod, i, 128.
2. Ibid, i, 145,271.
3. cf. Royal Articles, 1559, No.5 (Card. Doc. Annals, 1,243.)
4. Card. Synod. i,271.
5. cf. Neale, op.cit. 217.
6. Card. Synod, i,45.

against pluralities introduced in the House of Commons in 1584, protested the clergy in their convocation,[1] inter alia, "...impeacheth your majesty's prerogative royal; impaireth the revenue of the crown; overthroweth the study of divinity in both universities; depriveth men of the livings they do lawfully possess; beggareth the clergy; bringeth in a base and unlearned ministry; taketh away all hopes of a succession in learning..." Almost identical were the objections made by Fortescue in 1589,[2] and the civilian lawyer James in 1601,[3] against similar bills, the crux of the Anglican justification resting on the poverty of benefices and the need for "... extraorcinary reward for extraordinary Virtue."[4]

The London ministry, containing livings that contrasted strikingly in the value of their emoluments, and attracting, as it did, divines academically pre-eminent among contemporaries, offers a suitable testing ground with which to check the validity of the Anglican apologia for pluralism. Before analysing the type of living most often held in plurality, details of the distribution and quality of pluralists in the capital are necessary. In the absence of official certificates, - with the exception of the 1561 return -, recording the number simultaneously held, it has been found possible to be

---

1. Ibid, ii, 556-7.
2. Neale, op.cit. 226.
3. Ibid. 407.
4. Card. Doc. Annals, ii, 15.

precise only with regard to those who held more than one benefice in the city itself; these, consequently require separate treatment.

Their numbers increased dramatically during the course of the reign. The 1560 Certificates, covering eighty-six London parishes,[1] recorded six incumbents holding more than one City living, five being double[2] and two triple-beneficed.[3] Only one of them possessed the degree in civil law or divinity that authorised him to hold in plurality,[4] but at least two others are known to have been legally dispensed, possibly by virtue of chaplaincies.[5] Some of the others may have been similarly qualified, but on the whole their credentials suggest that episcopal toleration in allowing them to retain two City livings was attributable to the shortage of available clergy at that time. There was no change in the number of pluralists in the returns of the following year, but both the triple-beneficed incumbents had lost their third living.[6] Despite

---

1. 18 peculiars and 10 non-peculiars were omitted. The Certificate was drawn up on December 6th, 1560. (Mullins,255-268
2. Thomas Beacon; John Weale
   Alexander Smelly (Smythe)
   George Barton;
Another pluralist, not included in the certificate, was Thomas Mountain, R. of the peculiars of St. Faith and St. Pancras Soper Lane (Alumni Cantab.1,iii,223).
3. John Veron; Ralph Bentley.
4. Weale was a B.D. (Alumni Oxon. 1,iv,1587).
5. Bentley and Veron (SP.12/76, f.5v.,f.9r.). This document gives a list of dispensations for plurality between 1559-1570. Weale obtained both his livings long before Elizabeth's accessio his dispensation would not therefore be recorded in this document.
6. Mullins, 269-285 passim.

the death of three of these pluralists during the decade,[1] and the gradual improvement in clerical supply, the number of double-beneficed Londoners remained at seven in 1571, the losses being partly compensated by the extra preferment given to Henry Bedell and William Clark for eventually conforming in the vestiarian controversy of 1566.[2]

The number in 1577 had almost doubled, and henceforward it fluctuated between thirteen and fifteen until the end of the reign.[3] One reason for the sudden rise may have been the impact of the 1571 canons, which by imposing a limitation on the distance between two livings held in plurality, to some extent curtailed the facility with which a cleric could combine his City living with a rural cure. Consequently, City pluralism might be expected to increase to compensate for decreased opportunities elsewhere. Also accountable was the sharp proportionate improvement in the distribution of graduates among the incumbents between these years. Directly, more incumbents were academically qualified for a dispensation to hold in plurality; indirectly, the ratio of chaplains was likely to be greater among a graduate than a non-graduate ministry. It is significant that of all those who obtained their second City livings post-1571, only two were non-graduates

---

1. Beacon, Weale and Wymehurst.
2. CUL. MS. Mm, 1,29,f.3v.
3. 13(1577), 15(1583), 15(1589), 13(1595), 15(1601).

William Wager, perhaps held them by virtue of a chaplaincy,[1] while John Clarke, whose pluralism in 1599 offered the only case in London of a contravention of the 1585 articles debarring non-graduates from obtaining two livings, was somewhat exceptional in that the presentation to his second benefice followed a period there as coadjutor to the previous incumbent.[2]

The fact that the number of incumbents holding two City livings had dwindled to four by 1638[3] although no more stringent regulations were introduced post-1604, suggests that less calculable factors were likewise responsible for the increase as of the decline of London pluralism. Much must have depended on chance, the convenience of a vacancy in a City living rather than in the country within the mileage limits. Again, the choice of patron, particularly the favour of the Lord Chancellor with his vast resources of patronage, must have played a part in the location of a pluralist's second benefice. A third indefinable influence was the vocational factor of reconciling pluralism with diligent pastoral care. Where livings were all within easy walking distance of one another, this was not difficult; residence in one parish did not exclude the possibility of regular lectures and ministration in the other, as can be gleaned from the careers of several such pluralists.

---

1. He was rector of St. Benet Gracechurch (1567-91), and St. Michael Queenhithe (1574-91).
2. LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope, ii, f.328r.
3. Dale, ix.

William Wager resided in his parish of St. Michael Queenhithe, but read thrice-weekly lectures at his other church, St. Benet Gracechurch, as well as occasionally attending vestry meetings there.[1] Thomas Mortibois for over twenty years held both the rectories of St. Alphage and St. Martin Orgar; residing on the latter, he maintained sufficiently intimate contact with the parishioners of the former, to witness their last testaments and occasionally audit their church-wardens' accounts.[2] William Ashbold, chaplain to Whitgift and the favoured incumbent of two richly endowed rectories, St. Michael and St. Peter Cornhill, appears to have resided at the former,[3] but baptised six of his children in the latter church.[4] The fact that ministers like Wager, Arthur Bright and Thomas Gattacre, whose Puritanism, mild as it was, made them particularly sensitive to the possible abuses of pluralism, were able to hold two City livings simultaneously without deterrent conscientious scruples, suggests that one contributory factor in the increase of London pluralism lay in the facility with which the parson could

---

1. GLMS. 1568, p.223; SP. ii, 181,183.
2. GLMS. 1432/1 [no fol.]; MS. 9051/3, f.212v.; SP. ii,180,182.
3. He was non-resident at St. Peter in 1586, a year before his preferment to St. ichael (SP. ii,183). His lectures and periodic attendance at vestry meetings in the latter parish suggests he was at least intermittently resident there. (C.W.A. ed. W.H.Overall, 248, 251).
4. The Registers of St. Peter's Cornhill 1538-1666, ed. G.W. Leveson Gower, Harleian Soc. i (1877), 32,34,38,43,45,51,54.
5. Henn. 111,125,142,213.

remain actively responsible for both.

It is clear that a man holding two London benefices, while legally a pluralist, was less prone to the abuses consequent on pluralism than his counterpart whose incumbencies were anything up to thirty miles apart. Absenteeism was hardly an acute problem when techical non-residents were often found performing such routine ministerial chores as witnessing the testaments of their parishioners. The few surviving records of judicial proceedings against unauthorised pluralists absent from their cures, include none against clerics known to have been resident in another City parish. A further advantage for the purely London pluralist lay in his arrangements with the curate required by law in the non-resident benefice. The customary procedure was to alternate the curate's services between either parish with the parson's own attendance or absence, providing the assistant with perpetual problems of re-adjustment, but giving parishioners the utmost benefit of their parson's ministry.[1] Such elasticity was rarely possible where a day's journey might lie between two livings held in plurality.

Graver issues were raised by the pluralist who combined his London living with a country cure. According to the

---

1. cf. SP. ii,180-4. Ashborne (wrongly called Washborne) was curate to Wager in both livings, as was Brawler to Judson, and Payne to George Dickens.

official certificate drawn up in 1561, twenty-three such incumbents flourished in the 101 parishes covered by that survey.[1] Some of the rural benefices were near enough to London to allow for a certain amount of personal supervision in both parishes by the parson; the Scotsman Robert Richardson, for instance, combined his rectory of St. Matthew Friday Street with that of Chelsea;[2] Richard Beard held a vicarage in Greenwich as well as the rectory of St. Mary at Hill,[3] while Richard Langhorne, the Marian exile, added the vicarage of Edmonton to his perpetual curacy in London.[4] Others, however, held scattered preferments, ranging from the Sussex and Kentish livings in the possession of William Baldwin and Ralph Whytlin respectively,[5] to those enjoyed in Hereford and Gloucestershire by the incumbents of St. Botolph Billingsgate and Islington.[6] Two enjoyed preferments in Devon,[7] but the most far-flung, as he was also the most prolific, pluralist was Anthony Blake, vicar of St. Dunstan in the West, who held livings in the diocese of York as well as in Rugby and Barnet.[8] Of all the London incumbents he was least able to escape the

---

1. Mullins, 269-285, passim.
2. Ibid. 275.
3. Ibid. 278.
4. Ibid. 283.
5. Ibid. 269.
6. Ibid. 278,272.
7. Ibid. 272,276.
8. Ibid. 270

censure of a Paul's Cross preacher uttered a few years later: "Some of them will have iii iiii or v benefices, and thinke it a small matter to, but he will lye on never a one of these, and if he do, it shalbe on the least, because he wilbe at least costes, this man wilbe a protestant, but he is worse than a Papist, and such doinges requiers gods vengeance."[1]

Blake himself was said to reside in Yorkshire,[2] but the majority of these pluralists resided in London. Fourteen out of the twenty-three dwelt either in their own parishes or elsewhere in the City;[3] another lived in Westminster where he was a cathedral dignitary,[4] while four others were in a position to vary their residence periodically between city and country.[5] Thus only four of the 1561 pluralists appear to have been persistently absent from London; apart from Blake, William Jennins lived at Gloucester where he was the first dean of the cathedral, Edward Ryley resided in his Devon parish, and Richard Bruerne in his prebend at Windsor. All four employed curates in their non-resident London parishes.[6] It is clear that in so far as the London ministry was concerned, the

---

1. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10,f.86r. (September 8th, 1566). The preacher was one Eggram.
2. Mullins, 270.
3. Ralph, Whytlin, William Baldwin, John Dean (described as curate, but generally recognised as R. of St. Barts. Great), John Bacter, Thomas Chipping, Thomas Chamber, Thomas Norley, Robert Richardson, Giles Buskell, Griffith Williams, Thomas Withers, Richard Langhorne and John Armerar.
4. Humphrey Perkins (ibid. 280).
5. John Willoughby, William Dawes, Richard Woolan, and Richard Beard.
6. Ibid. 272,276,285.

possible adverse consequences of pluralism, even in the early years of the reign when the practice was least regulated, were substantially mitigated by the tendency of pluralists, - with the exception of those tied to cathedral positions elsewhere -, to reside in the city, if not actually within their own parishes. The unique opportunities offered by London for contacts with clerical patrons was doubtless among the firmest safeguards against absenteeism by City pluralists.

In the absence of later official certificates, our information on the extent of the subsequent practice of combining a City with a rural cure becomes much less precise. A tentative estimate for 1571 reveals twenty-two such pluralists,[1] but the ease with which London incumbents could also hold obscure rural livings without the knowledge of posterity, makes this no more than a minimum figure. It is at least apparent that despite the improvement in ministerial recruitment, there had been little, if any, decrease in the number of such pluralists since 1561. A possible reason may have been that in 1561 several of the London incumbents, recent ordinands at the commencement of their clerical careers, had as yet few opportunities for extending their preferments beyond the initial acquisition; by 1571, time and the favour of patrons

---

1. Henry Bedell, Rich Beard, Th Blage, Th Browne, Rob Chandelar, Wm Chatby, Th. Drant, Miles Garrard, Wm Gravett, Gilb Jennings, Wm May & Nowell Humphrey Perkins, Th Simpson, James Taylor, G Twydale, Th Tymme, Rich Tyrwhit, Ralph Whytlin, Griff H Williams, Henry Wright, and G. Young.

had allowed them to reap a larger reward. Miles Garrard, for instance, who was instituted to the rectory of St. Mary Woolnoth in 1558 and was described as single-beneficed in 1561, obtained a dispensation to hold in plurality in the following year.[1] Henry Bedell, ordained and collated to his first benefice in 1561, received further City preferments in 1563 and 1567, and in 1570 was presented by the Lord Chancellor to the rectoryof Timberscombe.[2]

The Puritan survey of the London ministry in 1586, recording details of pluralism and non-residence among incumbents, allows for greater precision in an estimate of double-beneficed men. With the exception of the information on John Hallward, rector of St. Benet Paul's Wharf, who by being wrongly identified with John Horsfall, rector of St. Mary Mounthaw,[3] was incorrectly described as a pluralist, the Survey appears to have been accurately with regard to clerics holding two livings in the City itself. The facts concerning those who combined a rural with an urban cure, cannot be thoroughly tested, but only two actual inconsistencies and another possible error have been discovered.[4] The latter group,

---

1. PRO. SP. 12/76, f.24r.
2. Henn. 249,125; Lansd. MS. 443, f.184v.
3. SP. ii, 182.
4. William Cotton, R. of St. Margaret New Fish St., was described in one part of the Survey as living in the country (SP.ii,96), but in the detailed list he was not denoted as a non-resident (ibid.182). In fact, his attendance at vestry meetings suggests that he was as often resident as his chaplaincy duties to Aylmer allowed him to be. A possible error concerned Arthur Williams, R. of St. Andrew Wardrobe.

it can be estimated from the Survey, amounted to twenty-two,[1] of whom as many as eighteen were non-resident in their London benefices.[2]

The restrictions on pluralism imposed by the 1571 canons, it is clear, had no more than a temporary effect in London, for the 1586 figures are only imperceptibly less than those estimated for 1571. If pluralism had not been reduced, however, the geographical distribution of pluralistic livings had been reorientated by the mileage limitations imposed in 1571, the great majority of the rural benefices henceforward being in the adjoining counties of Essex, Middlesex, Surrey and Kent. Prolonged absenteeism in livings as remote as in Devonshire or the province of York could no longer provide ammunition for critics of the ministry.

More alarming was the extremely high incidence of non-residence among these pluralist incumbents, a striking deterioration from the position in 1561 and even in 1574 when it can be estimated from a survey made by Sandys in his episcopal visitation that a maximum of eight pluralists whose London incumbencies came under episcopal jurisdiction, were

---

1. Wood, Williams, Bancroft, King, Tymme, Banks, Walker, Copcot, Boleyn, Gattacre, Clay, Young, Cradock, Withers, Cotton, Ryley, Green, Webb, Archpool (Ashbold), Gravett, Duffield, and Wright.
2. The exceptions were Clay, Cotton, Webb and Wright.

absentees from their City livings.[1] It is possible to assume that some may have dwelt elsewhere in the City, being non-resident in no more than a strictly literal sense, or spent a substantial part of the year in London. Arthur Williams, for instance, described as "...Living in the Country," kept a sufficiently close contact with his City parish of St. Andrew Wardrobe to audit the accounts of the church wardens annually.[3] William Cotton was similarly described, yet he frequently attended the vestry meetings of his London parish.[4]

Nevertheless, the general complexion of the group "...Living in the Country"[5], men whose academic qualifications were well above the average, is an indication of the one unfortunate consequence of the installation of the ablest divines in City

---

1. GLMS. 9537/3, [no fol.]. Non-residents were noted down in the visitation book. The eight calculated to be pluralists with a City and a rural benefice, were Henry Bedell (V. of Christ Church and R. of Timberscombe);
Gilbert Jennings (V. of St. Dunstan in West; location of country living not known);
John Smith (R. of St. Alban Wood St.; " "
William Chakley (R. of Holy Trinity Less; " "
Peter White (R. of Nicholas Cole Abbey; " "
John Young (R. of St. Magnus; " "
Humphrey Perkins (R. of St. Margaret New Fish St. and R. of Islip); John Lunne (R. of St. James Garlickhithe; country living not known).
2. SP. ii,96.
3. GLMS. 2088/1, [no fol.].
4. GLMS. 1175/1, [no fol.].
5. SP. ii,95. Neither Absolon nor Harward fall within the scope of this thesis, as their London churches, in Southwark and St. Clement Danes respectively, did not come within the London archdeaconry.

benefices by archbishop and bishop. Their very distinction made them the most liable for selection to teaching and administrative posts in one of the universities, exalted cathedral dignities, chaplaincies to the leading ecclesiastical and secular figures of the day. His duties at Cambridge as Vice-Chancellor explains the absence of John Copcot, pluralist rector of St. Dunstan in the East, from his City benefice in 1586;[1] Edward Cradock, the non-resident incumbent of St. Mary Aldermary, was Lady Margaret reader of the divinity lecture at Oxford;[2] George Boleyn's absence from St. Dionis Backchurch may be accounted to the deanship of Lichfield cathedral which he had held since 1576;[3] the rectory of St. Magnus was held *in commendam* by John Young, bishop of Rochester. William Cotton was an archdeacon, John Walker had only recently resigned a similar dignity,[4] while most of the remainder held chaplaincies either with Whitgift or a peer of the realm.[5] The increase in non-residence among London pluralists, it may be argued, was

---

1. Alumni *Cantab.* 1,i,393.
2. Alumni *Oxon.* 1,i,344.
3. Le Neve, i, 563.
4. Cotton was archdeacon of Lewes 1578-?1598; Walker resigned the archdeaconry of Essex about August, 1585 (Le Neve, ii,336).
5. Wood, Bancroft, Webb and Ashbold were all archiepiscopal chaplain . Bell in 1588 was dispensed to hold in plurality by virtue of his chaplaincy to the bishop of Winchester (Lansd. MS. 53,75). Gattacre obtained a similar faculty in 1584 as chaplain to the Earl of Leicester (LCCRO. Lib. V.G. Stanhope,*i*, f.221v.). For Tymmes' patrons cf. *DNB*.

a by-product of the improved academic status of the City ministry in the later part of the reign. The 1601 figures, approximate as they are, suggest that the incidence of pluralism was only imperceptibly less than that of 1586;[1] unfortunately, there is insufficient information on the proportion of London absentees among these pluralists to allow for a comparison with the figures in the Puritan survey.

London, as the 1586 analysis indicated, on the whole bore out the contention of Anglican apologists in the second half of the reign that pluralism constituted an "...extraordinary reward for extraordinary virtue." Less satisfactory was the other principal argument, that the poverty of existing benefices made pluralism indispensable for the well-being of the church. In fact, the poorest of the City livings were generally the least likely to maintain a pluralist incumbent. Four successive rectors of All Hallows London Wall, officially valued at £8. 7. 2½d, were all single-beneficed,[2] as were three out of the five Elizabethan incumbents of St. Alphage, of similar valuation.[3] There is no indication that any of the six rectors of St. Bartholomew the Great, assessed at £8, held two livings.[4]

1 15 cases can be ascertained, but several other clergy probably held rural livings that cannot be identified

2. Reniger, Buckmaster, Pitts and Janeway (Henn.83; VE, 1,374).
3. Cooke, Sheriff and Smith (Henn.86; VE,1,371). Veron's incumbency 1559-61 is omitted by Hennessy (cf. Mullins, 429).
4. Henn. 101. The parish had not been created at the time of the Valor, but was valued at £8 in the Lord Chancellor's presentation files (Lansd.MS.444, f.126r.).

There were no known pluralists among the eight rectors of St. George Botolph Lane in possession between 1558-1603.[1] The four Elizabethan incumbents of the £8 living of St. Margaret Pattens all appear to h ve been resident and single-beneficed,[2] Exceptions were the three livings of similar value, in the gift of ecclesiastical patrons who tended to prefer pluralist protégés,[3] and the three rectories, assessed respectively at £7.7s., £6..0s., and £5.6s., which could not possibly maintain a single-beneficed incumbent.[4] At least four incumbents took advantage of the clause in the Henrician statute allowing livings worth less than £8 a year to be held in plurality without a dispensation; John Owgar, Anthony Seyntper, Rowland Herring and Morgan Benyon all in turn combined the incumbency of St. Mary Staining with that of St. Olave Silver Stree , their total income officially amounting to £12. 14. 7d.[5]

Generally, however, the incumbents of benefic s valued at less than £10 a year tended to remain single-beneficed, augmenting

---

1. Henn.109-10. Roberts is described as holding 2 livings in the Survey (SP.ii,181), but the authors appear to have confused the minor canonry which he held at St. Paul's with a benefice with cure. Cathedral offices did not involve a cure of souls, and could therefore be held with another living without giving the holder a pluralist status.
2. Henn. 287; VE. 1,376.
3. e.g. St. Anne and St. Agnes, in the bishop's collation, had at least three pluralist incumbents (Bentley, Aylward, King); St. Benet Paul's Wharf (Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's) also had three (Harvey, Horsfall and Jones); Holy Trinity Less (D. and C. Canterbury) at least two (Chambers and Pyley).
4. St. Olave Silv r St., St. Mary Mounthaw, and St. Mary Staining respectively. (VE. 1,372-5).
5. Henn. 73,338.

their income by means of subsidiary employment in adjoining cures where the parson was non-resident,[1] or in clerical positions attached to public bodies in the City.[2] Many of them were not qualified to obtain a dispensation, possessing neither adequate academic credentials nor the qualities likely to give them a chaplaincy, for it was inevitable that until the later years of the reign the poorer livings attracted the least qualified clergymen. A further deterrent from holding in plurality was the prohibitive cost of maintaining a curate in the non-resident living; a parson, obliged to pay a stipend of £8 (or upward) to his curate, would benefit little from holding a second living whose income, according to the official assessment, might well be less than £10, particularly when the taxes due to the Crown were taken into consideration.[3]

In contrast, the great majority of the wealthiest livings in London,[4] - fourteen were assessed at over £30 a year -, were held in plurality, particularly post-1570. The most lucrative, St. Magnus, was retained in commendam by the bishop of Rochester for fifteen years, and subsequently given to the archdeacon of

---

1. e.g. Thomas Buckmaster, R. of the £8 living of All Hallows London Wall in 1564, earned £20 a year between 1568-1571 as curate to the non-resident incumbent of St. Mary Woolnoth. (GLMS. 1002/1, ff.143r.-160v. passim).
2. cf. Chapter IX.
3. cf. Chapter VII, sub Expenditure.
4. All Hallows Barking, All Hallows Bread St., St. Dunstan in East, St. Dunstan in West, St. Giles Cripplegate, St. Magnus, St. Margaret New Fish St., St. Martin Ludgate, St. Mary Aldermary, St. Mary Hill, St. Mary le Bow, St. Michael Cornhill, St. Peter Cornhill, and St. Vedast.

London.[1] As ten of these benefices were in the gift of ecclesiastical patrons,[2] they were generally filled by archiepiscopal or episcopal chaplains, all qualified to hold more than one living. Indeed, of all the clergymen in this group of £30 + livings, only nine are believed to have been consistently single-beneficed throughout their incumbencies,[3] of whom four were nonconformists of the 1559-1566 period.[4] Later in the reign, Thomas White, Lancelot Andrews and Robert Crowley constituted the outstanding exceptions to the general practice in these livings, although the earlier career of the latter had been vigorously pluralistic.[5]

Ecclesiastical policy in disposing of the most lucrative preferments in this manner was doubtless influenced by the need to induce the ablest young men into the ministry as well as to reward chaplains and personal protégés. The contrast, however, with the single-beneficed incumbents of the poorest City livings presented a picture hardly consonant with the Anglican apologia of pluralism on the grounds of the poverty of benefices. The disposal of patronage was related less to financial need than

---

1. Henn. 274. The living was assessed at £67.12.1. (VE.i,373).
2. The exceptions were St. Dunstan in West (Sackville family), St. Mary Hill (private), St. Michael Cornhill (Drapers Co.) and St. Peter Cornhill (Lord Mayor).
3. Horton and Coverdale (St. Magnus), Philpot (St. Michael Cornhill), Gough (St. Peter Cornhill), White (St. Dunstan in West), Andrews (St. Giles Cripplegate), Cole (St. Mary Bow), Dove (St. Mary Aldermary), and Crowley in his second period at St. Giles Cripplegate.
4. Horton, Coverdale, Philpot and Gough.
5. cf. A.Peel, Robert Crowley; Puritan, Printer Priest (The Presbyterian Society of England (1937), passim.

to academic distinction, a policy that tended to create two distinct clerical classes in London; in the choicest livings were pluralists, men whose very ability was often the cause of their absenteeism by virtue of their obligations elsewhere, their cathedral or university appointments which in some cases might culminate in seats on the episcopal bench.[1] By comparison the occupants of the poorest livings appeared humble and insignificant, men whose poverty was less of a spur than a curb to their holding in plurality. Necessitous as their single-beneficed status may have been, there can be little doubt which class more closely approximated to the image of the faithful pastor.

---

1. Eighteen Elizabethan London incumbents were appointed or designated bishops.

CHAPTER SIX

PATRONAGE AND PREFERMENT.

Wherein lay the key to a successful career in the Elizabethan church? Robert Browne, in his early Congregationalist days, had a ready answer.[1] Suitable assets, in his opinion, were a Cambridge degree, bribes and flattery, the "...favour of some Patrone or Bishoppe, or wordly man", and, above all, ambition. "Did they not finde out a living before they found out meete people for thier calling? And did they not gather their stipendes and tythinges before they had gathered the scattered of the flocke?" More moderate critics shared Browne's views, but placed the responsibility for the absence of vocational standards on the patron rather than the clergyman. The lay patron in fact became a favourite object of attack by both Puritan and Anglican apologists. To the former, the abuses of the patronage system provided a valuable prop for their campaign for greater congregational participation in ministerial appointments; the same excesses explained, to the satisfaction of the latter, why so many ill-qualified men were able to hold livings. "Refusing to admit those which be worthie", Thomas Tymme lamented,[2] "but preferring those which

---

1. Robert Browne, A Treatise upon 23 of Matthewe (1582) Sig. H 3, f.2v.
2. T.Tymme, A Discoverie of ten English lepers (1592), Sig. D2, f.3v.

vnworthie, they [patrons] call to the inheritance of Gods sanctuarie, Schismatiques, seditious persons, Atheists, ignorant and vnlearned Asses, flatterers, and sometime their owne kinsmen, and familiars, how vnmeete soeuer."

Through the avarice of patrons, men of integrity, "... able to do much good in the Church of God",[1] were denied the opportunity of preferment. John Dove was resigned "...to die within the precintes of the colledge, like a monke shut up in his cell, or an heremite mured up within the compasse of a wall..."[2] for his refusal to buy his way to preferment. An 'honest godlie minister' might, as James Bisse declared,[3] rather beg than accept a presentation on such conditions, but many were the 'chapmen' and 'journey-men', who betrayed no such scruples, and settled for a share of the profits of their livings, the substance going into the patron's pocket. Thus was created, according to Thomas Drant,[4] a ministry that could be likened unto cucumbers, "...the whiche Cucumers, if it thunder from heaven turne themselves round about, [and] ...if there be any thundryng from the Court...turne their affection and that very roundly." Somewhat more epigrammatic was Robert Temple's analysis of the evil consequences of abuses in the

---

1. E.Bush, A Sermon preached at Pauls crosse (1576), Sig. F2, f.2r.
2. J.Dove, A Ser on preached at Paules Crosse (1596), Sig.A1, f.1r.
3. J.Bisse, [A Sermon] at Paules Crosse (1581), 66.
4. T.Drant, A fruitfull and necessary S rmon (1572), Sig.D1, f.1r.

patronage system.[1] " ee covet not spirituall giftes, but spirituall pro otions, not a calling, but the living, not the benefice, but the bene ices of the church."

Such was the dismal picture conjured up by critics, both Puritan and Anglican apologists. The worst alleged abuse, the preferment of ill-qualified clerics at the expense of their abler and more honest peers, has already been proved largely unsubstantiated in so far as the London ministry was concerned.[2] The inconsistency can be resolved not by dismissing outright the generalisations of contemporaries, extravagant as some may have been, but by comparing the distribution of patronage in the capital with that elsewhere. Accoraing to Bancroft, five out of every six benefices with cure throughout the country were held by lay patrons in 1604.[3] Excluding impropriation, 223 out of 314 livings in Winchester diocese were in the gift of Crown or lay patrons.[4] In Worcester diocese in 1585, about 75% of the total were similarly held.[5] Royal or private patrons held 175 of 220 non-impropriated b nefices in the archdeaconry of Norfolk in 1603.[6] By contrast, of the 111 livings in London,

---

1. R.Temple, A Sermon: e ched at Paules Crosse (1592), Sig. D2, f.1r.
2. cf. Chapter III.
3. Quoted by R.G.Usher, The econstruction of the English Church (1910), i, 338.
4. Ibid. 112.
5. Miss D.M.Barratt, The Condition of the Paris Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester, and Gloucester (D.Phil. Oxford 1949),353
6. Usher, op.cit. i, 112.

only 49 were in the gift of non-clerical or non-collegiate bodies; the 44% of the total that they represented was far below the ratios elsewhere, and was little more than half the national average. Such differences in the distribution of patronage could not fail to have consequences on the quality of the clergy, their academic and preaching qualifications, and, above all, on the degree of their conformity in the religious controversies of the reign.

(i) THE DISTRIBUTUON OF PATRONAGE

The traditional pattern of patronage in London, as elsewhere, had been undermined by the dissolution of the monasteries. The extent of the shift in the balance of power may be illustrated by comparing the position on the eve of the dissolution with that in 1603.

	1535	1603
Religious houses	57	-
Archbishop (or Dean and Ch.)Canterbury	13	17
Dean and Ch. of St. Paul's	20	21
Bishop of London	3	13
Other ecclesiastics	2	7
Collegiate bodies	1	4
Crown	3	18
Mayor and Corporation	2	4
City Companies	2	5
Private individuals	6	16
Parish trustees	-	6
	109	111

(a) Ecclesiastical atrons

Monastic advowsons were appropriated by the Crown on the dissolution; subsequently, many of them were either sold or granted to private individuals, thus introducing a vast new class of laymen into the ranks of the church patrons. In London, however, despite the former dominance of religious houses, the secularisation of patronage was far from complete. Through the generosity of the Crown, particularly of Mary, ecclesiastical patrons indeed benefited to some extent from the dissolution, as the hierarchy responsible for the clerical government of the capital, - archbishop of Canterbury, dean and chapter of St. Paul's, and bishop of London -, were all able to consolidate their patronage interests. With fifty-eight livings in the gift of ecclesiastics, and another four held by collegiate bodies dominated by clerics, the church remained the principal patron in London. Provided an effective community of interest between clerical patrons was sustained, the significance of this patronage pattern on the composition of the clergy was three-fold, in terms of their academic quality, the orthodoxy of their opinions, and the absence of abuses associated with lay patrons. These associations can be tested by an analysis of the chief classes of ecclesiastical patrons.

Archbishop of Canterbury. The thirteen Canterbury peculiars, seven in the collation of the archbishop, the remainder presented by the dean and chapter, were untouched by the Henrician changes.

Four other London rectories, formerly in the gift of local religious houses, were granted to Cranmer in the capacity of a presentative patron.[1] The archbishop also occasionally found opportunity to present to other livings when the true patron had been unable to present within the prescribed interval of six months following the departure of the preceding incumbent, and the bishop had failed to exercise the right that fell to him by a lapse of this kind. Thus, Richard Smith was presented to the rectory of St. Margaret Pattens by Archbishop Parker after a two year vacancy during which neither the Lord Mayor, the original patron, nor the bishop of London had succeeded in filling the living.[2]

Archiepiscopal patronage rights were made more important by the substantial value of many of the benefices in his gift. Ten were worth £25 or more in the Valor Ecclesiasticus, and three of these were over £40 in value; only two were assessed at less than £10, an income regarded by Cranmer as reasonable for a qualified divine in 1539.[3] The most distinguished clerics who aspired to work in London, thus found it profitable to seek archiepiscopal favour. In fact, the most lucrative benefices were largely reserved as a preserve for the archbishop's chaplains, a practice that may have caused resentment among

---

1. All Hallows Barking, All Hallows Great, Holy Trinity Less, and St. Edmund Lombard Street.
2. Henn. 287.
3. VE. 1,270-1

less fortunate clerics, but was a safe guarantee of both the quality and the conservatism of the incumbent. Three successive vicars of All Hallows Barking were chaplains to Whitgift,[1] as were George Best and William Barlow, incumbents of the £60 rectory of St. Dunstan in the East in the 1590s.[2] Whitgift, who was particularly prone to install chaplains in his peculiars, preferred Christopher Webb, Humphrey Cole, and Francis Dalton in similar fashion.[3] Earlier in the reign, Parker had found his City patronage rights useful to reward certain ministers for their conformity in the vestiarian controversy,[4] thus setting in motion a policy that demanded strictly orthodox views among those preferred to the archiepiscopal livings. Thomas Gattacre, mild Puritan as he was, provides the only known instance of a suspect conformist receiving preferment at the archbishop's hands, and his admission may well have been due to the influence of his patron, the Earl of Leicester,[5] The Canterbury-controlled livings constituted a formidable bulwark of the interests of the ecclesiastical establishment, and formed an important training ground for the episcopal bench of the next generation.[6]

---

1. Richard Wood, Thomas Ravis, Robert Tighe.
2. Alumni Cantab. 1,i,90,144.
3. GLMS. 9535/2, f.57r.; Lambeth MS. Whitgift's Register,i,458.
4. cf. Earl's notebook, CUL. MS. Mm, 1,29, f.3v.
5. He was a chaplain to Leicester (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope,i, f.22lv.).
6. cf. Chapter III, pp 86-7

Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's. Their position as the largest single patron in London had emerged unscathed from the Henrician changes. Four of the twenty-one livings were peculiars, exempt from diocesan jurisdiction;[1] the remainder were collative, the bishop having no voice in the admission of the incumbent. St. Mary Magdalene Old Fish Street and St. Gregory were in the gift of the minor canons of St. Paul's, the latter being appropriated to their use in 1445;[2] the others were disposed of by the dean and twenty-nine prebendaries who composed the chapter.

Amicable relations between the bishop and the chapter of the cathedral see, have never been traditional in English diocesan activity. It is clear that the London relationship was sometimes strained during the Elizabethan period, particularly over the tardiness of the bishop to subscribe his due share towards the rebuilding of the cathedral steeple after the 1561 fire, and following Dean Nowell's refusal to install Aylmer's son as archdeacon of London in 1591.[3] Despite the periodic tension, the chapter does not appear to have pursued an independent course in its appointments to benefices. Generally, the livings were granted to members of the chapter, and as the prebendaries were all collated to their prebends by

---

1. St. Giles Cripplegate, St. Helen Bishopsgate, St. Faith and St. Gregory.
2. Henn. 318,320.
3. cf. pp.62-3

the bishop, the chapter very often gave preferment to one of his protégés. William Hutchinson, chaplain to Aylmer, and prebendary of Hoxton, and later of Wildland, was collated by the dean and chapter to the rectory of St. Michael Bassishaw in 1589.[1] Thomas Drant, chaplain to Bishop Grindal, and holder of the prebendal stall of Chamberlainwood in 1569, obtained the valuable vicarage of St. Giles Cripplegate in similar fashion.[2] William Palmer was another of Grindal's protégés to be collated by St. Paul's after holding a cathedral prebend.[3] Albeit indirectly, the bishop of London exerted considerable influence on the appointment of clerics to livings in the gift of the dean and chapter.

Just as the archbishop rewarded his own chaplains, the cathedral chapter tended to prefer its own members. Competition was doubtless less fierce, for only St. Giles Cripplegate was assessed at over £25 in the Valor, and seven of the livings were worth less than £10.[4] Standards were consequently much lower, and few of the poorest livings were occupied for a prolonged period by the same incumbent. Usually, they were disposed of among the minor canons of the cathedral, a body of

---

1. Henn. 331.
2. Ibid. 172.
3. Ibid. 331.
4. St. Gregory, St. Helen Bishopsgate, St. John Zachary, St. Nicholas Olave, St. Olave Silver St., St. eter le Poer, and St. Peter Paul's Wharf.

clerics not conspicuous for its vocational zeal if we are to believe contemporary visitation returns.[1] Nor, indeed, did de n and chapter, - at least in the early part of the reign -, betray the same insistence on conformable opinions as the archbishop.[2] As is shown elsewhere, Grindal's sympathy with the radical party allo ed several mild nonconformists to hold prebendal stalls in the early 1560s, and some years passed before this radical tinge was finally lost. William Wager, at one time regarded by Thomas Wilcox as a promising recruit to the Puritan movement, owed his double-preferment in the City to the patronage of the dean and chapter.[3] Thomas Spering, one of the most troublesome of the London incumbents in the 1580s, held the rectory of St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street by the like favour.[4] The most important Puritan beneficiary as Robert Crowley, who held a pr bend and two St. Paul's collations before his deprivation in 1566, and was later restored to his vicarage in Cripplegate.[5] Dean and chapter were clearly less rigid in their sel ctions than the archbishop, but fell far short of his standards with regard to the educational qualifications of their candidates.

---

1. e.g. Bancroft's visit tion 1598 (GLMS. 9537/9). Extracts are quoted in A History of St. Paul's Cathedral, ed. W.R. Matthews and W.M.Atkins (1957), 147-53.
2. Chapter X.
3. Henn. 79.
4. Ibid. 268.
5. DNB.

Bishop of London. Among clerical patrons, the bishop profited most from the re-distribution of patronage at the dissolution of the monasteries. The remarkable improvement in his position was due not to the liberality of Henry VIII, but to the failure of the short-lived Henrician experiment to establish a bishopric of Westminster. On its demise in 1553, Mary transferred a group of City advowsons, - some of them extremely valuable -, which had been attached to that see on the dissolution of the convent of Westminster, to the bishop of London.[1] The Elizabethan bishops then found themselves the beneficiaries of the action of a queen from whose religious policy three of them had fled into exile.[2] Their control over the appointment of clergymen for whom they were responsible as the ordinary of the diocese, was much extended; more positively, they were provided with a substantial nucleus of advowson rights with which to build up an episcopal following in the City.

The values of these livings varied sharply. Four of the thirteen, including St. Magnus, the highest prized rectory in London, were worth £25 or more,[3] but three were assessed at less than £10.[4] The standard of incumbents inevitably fluctuated

---

1. Before 1553, only St. Andrew Undershaft, St. Botolph Bishopsgate, and St. Christopher Stocks were in the episcopal collations.
2. i.e. Grindal, Sandys, and Aylmer.
3. The three others were St. Margaret New Fish St., St. Martin Ludgate, and St. Andrew Undershaft.
4. St. Alphage, St. Anne and St. Agnes, and St. Katherine Coleman.

according to the value of the benefice. The difficulty with regard to the poorest among them was not so much to obtain the presentation of a reasonably-qualified cleric, but to persuade him to retain the living for any length of time other than in anticipation of better preferment. At the £8 rectory of St. Anneand St. Agnes, there were six different incumbents in the twelve years 1575-87; five had enjoyed a university education, and regarded their incumbency as no more than temporary phase.[1] Such livings were sometimes useful as a preliminary stepping-stone for an episcopal protégé; James Smith and Simon Buttery, for instance, collated respectively to St. Alphage and St. Anne and St. Agnes, were both young ordinands who had emerged directly from service in Aylmer's household.[2] At other times, particularly in the earlier part of the reign when there was little competition for the poorer benefices, the curate of the church, seldom well-qualified, would find himself elevated to the incumbency. Robert Sheriff obtained St. Alphage in this fashion,[3] as did Hugh Treton who was collated rector of St. Ethelburgheafter a ten year apprentice-ship as assistant curate.[4] Very likely, the recommendation of parishioners helped to give such men their livings.

---

1. Henn. 95. The exception was William Aylward.
2. GLMS. 9535/1, f.159r.; 9535/2, f.60r.
3. GLMS. 1432/2 [no fol.].
4. Lambeth MS. Tenison 711, 19.

A nucleus of benefices that could attract the ablest men of the day, however, remained in the episcopal collation. As was characteristic of clerical patronage, the bishop of London placed priority on rewarding his own dependents. As the latter were generally chaplains taken into the episcopal household after successful university careers, the practice was by no means deleterious; in fact, these livings often provided pulpits for the ablest men of the day, several of them later taking their places on the episcopal bench, or attaining to decanal or archdiaconal rank. The rectory of St. Magnus was successively occupied by Miles Coverdale, erstwhile bishop of Exeter; John Young who for many years held it in commendam with the see of Rochester; and Theophilus Aylmer, archdeacon of London.[1] The three Elizabethan incumbents of St. Margaret New Fish Street attained respectively to sub-decanal rank at Westminster, the bishopric of Exeter, and the archbishopric of York.[2]

An episcopal following in the City was thus ensured by preferring chaplains and other dependents to the most lucrative benefices. Grindal tended to use his patronage rights to the advantage of his ex-emigré colleagues, - Coverdale, Horton, Veron, and Bendall are ready examples -, but, as the bishop of

---

1. Henn. 274.
2. Ibid. 276.

London in the time of Aylmer and ancroft, became identified with a policy of the strictest uniformity, the episcopal livings proved an invaluable City platform for the dissemination of orthodox views by men whose ability was equal to that of the foremost Puritan critics. Aylmer in particular managed to build up a reliable Anglican nucleus by skilful preferment of his carefully-chosen domestic chaplains. William Hutchinson and Thomas Crowe both held City livings in plurality for a number of years post-1577; William Cotton, whose disciplinary methods as bishop of Exeter strongly resembled those of his mentor, Aylmer, was for twenty years rector of St. Margaret New Fish Street; George Dickens, William Gravett, and John Young, were other prominent incumbents of the Aylmerian model.[1] Bancroft's patronage of Samuel Harsnet, Peter Lilly, and Stephen Gosson was along the same lines. Only one known Puritan managed to evade episcopal vigilance after the accession of Aylmer; this was Arthur Bright, a popular City preacher, who was collated to the rectory of St. Botolph Bishopsgate in 1590, by means of what strongly hinted of an unofficial exchange with the preceding incumbent.[2]

Episcopal influence in the selection of City incumbents was by no means confined to the livings that lay officially

---

1. cf. Chapter III for further details.
2. The previous incumbent was instituted to Bright's old rectory in Cambridgeshire in the same year (Ely Episcopal Records, ed. A.Gibbons (Lincoln 1891), 447.

in his gift. Collative rights were enjoyed by the bishop in benefices where the patron had failed to present within the prescribed interval of six months following the departure of the previous incumbents, and these rights by lapse were occasionally exercised during the Elizabethan period. Aylmer in 1578 presented to St. Alban Wood Street on the failure of the patrons, Eton College, to fill the living within the required time.[1] Vigilance in such matters was a worthwhile episcopal asset, but the bishop did not always take the opportunity to prefer his own followers. At St. Lawrence Jewry, the vicarage of which was in the gift of the impropriate rectors, Balliol College, the parishioners made frequent efforts to control the presentation. In 1575, the Master of Balliol agreed to grant the advowson to the parish pro hac vice, adding that if the Fellows, the joint-patrons, refused to confirm the grant, he would allow the presentation to fall into lapse, so that the "...Lorde Bishopp myghte confyrme our [parishioners'] Doinges."[2] His fears were borne out: the advowson lapsed, and the bishop presented the candidate who had been elected by the vestry.[3] Parochial pressure was by no means a rare feature, as will be seen, but the case presents an ingenious instance of the deliberate manipulation of the device of a lapse by two

---

1. Henn. 72.; cf. ibid. 88, 393.
2. GLMS. 2590/1, p.51.
3. Henn. 267.

interested parties.[1]

Evidence of indirect episcopal influence on the selection of incumbents is difficult to obtain, but it may well have been considerable. The bishop was, after all, the focal point of diocesan patronage. To him came the aspiring young cleric who lacked a private patron. His ordination ceremonies, and the advise of his examining chaplains, gave him a fair knowledge of the qualities and potentialities of the London ordinand. It was therefore inevitable that patrons who presented to a number of livings, or who had no personal protégé to advance, should turn to the bishop for commendation of candidates. In certain parishes in Essex and elsewhere, the bishop in fact enjoyed the right to nominate clerics to the patron for presentation;[2] his claims were less categorical in London, but livings in the gift of the Lord Chancellor were often filled according to an episcopal recommendation. Thomas Buckmaster was presented to the rectory of All Hallows London Wall in 1564 at the petition of Grindal, as was John Scarlet to St. Bartholomew Exchange in 1567.[3] Altogether, the bishop of London recommended thirteen of the thirty-eight clerics presented by the Lord Chancellor to his

---

1. cf. St. Barts. Hospital Journals (H.a.1/2, f.220v.) for another instance, whereby an incumbent resigned without the cognizance of the patron, hoping thereby that the presentation would lapse to the bishop.
2. HMC., Second Report, 89. The livings were in the Crown gift
3. Lansd. MS. 443, ff.133v.,159r.

London livings between 1559-76.[1]

Private patrons, not confronted with the vast patronage tasks of the Lord Chancellor, were probably less dependent on episcopal assistance. The bishop did, however, exert some influence in appointments made by the Lord Mayor and Corporation to their City livings. He was particularly interested in the occupants of the valuable and important rectory of St. Peter Cornhill. A vacancy occurring in 1566, for instance, Grindal wrote to the Mayor "...for the goodwill and Assente of the same to hym to be granted for the n minacon and appoyntment of a parson..."[2] The Mayor and his aldermen first demanded the attendance of the episcopal candidate along with other suitors, but eventually presented the former. On two other occasions, Grindal's nominee was accepted,[3] but his advocacy of his chaplain, John Veron, for the vicarage of Christ Church in 1560 was unsuccessful; a rival candidate, backed by a recommendation from Robert Dudley, proved more acceptable to the City corporation.[4] Episcopal nomination was evidently not invariably a guarantee of a presentation, but evidence of his influence, both

---

1. Ibid. 443. Post-1576, the Crown presentation lists did not include the names of the petitioners until Egerton became Lord Keeper in 1596 (Bodl. MS. Tanner 179).
2. LCRO Kp 16, f.74r.
3. Ibid, ff.151v., 247r.
4. Ibid. 14, ff.210v., 245v. The lesson was not lost on Veron. In the following year, he dedicated his book, A moste necessary treatise of free wil (1561), to Dudley, "...the M c ■ s and patron of all godlye learninge and true religion." (Eleanor Rosenbarg, Leicester, Patron of Letters (New York 1955), 202-3.)

direct and indirect, is sufficiently frequent to bring out his pre-eminent position among the London patrons.

Other Clerical and Collegiate Patrons. There were eleven such livings by the end of the Elizabethan period. Three were in the gift of the dean and chapter of Westminster, who were no less ready than other ecclesiastical foundations to reward their own members.[1] The preferment of the Welsh Puritan, Henry Holland, to St. Bride in 1593, suggests the susceptibility of the chapter to the influence of the Earl of Essex, Holland's patron, at this time.[2] Some unorthodox appointments were also made at St. Botolph Aldersgate, a perpetual curacy to which the patron could donate without submitting the nominee to the bishop for institution. The incumbents included William Wilkinson, very probably the writer associated with Thomas Cartwright,[3] and John Morrison, one of the very few Scottish Presbyterian ordinands to serve in the Church of England without being re-ordained.[4]

---

1. e.g. Thomas Brown, R. of St. Leonard Foster Lane, was headmaster of Westminster, where he was also sub-dean (Alumni Cantab. 1,i,238.
2. Holland was a chaplain to Essex, to whom he dedicated his Treatise on Witchcraft (DNB.).
3. A note on Wilkinson appears in Cartwrightiana, ed. A.Peel and L.H.Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, i (1951), 120-6. The editors tend to attribute The Holy Exercise of a True Fast (1580), generally thought to be written by Wilkinson, to Cartwright. Wilkinson is described as a layman, living in St. Botolph Aldersgate, but very likely he can be identified with the minister of that name, who was perpetual curate of the parish between 1580-2 (GLMS.9537/4 [no fol.]; MS.1454,Nos.83,84)
4. Supra, p.p 56-7

Extra-capitular ecclesiastical authorities, - with the exception of the archbishop -, were poorly represented among the London patrons. The bishop of Hereford held the advowson of St. Mary Mounthaw, a poverty-stricken living that could be filled only by being held in plurality. Somewhat more substantial was St. Martin Vintry, a rectory granted by Henry VIII to the bishop of Worcester on the dissolution of the convent of St. Peter, Gloucester; for most of the reign it was held by a well-qualified pluralist who may possibly have been brought to episcopal notice by the parishioners.[1] The dean and chapter of Windsor had a connection with the perpetual curacy, St. Benet Finck, a poor living that accommodated none but passing migrants or an ill-qualified ordinand, until Thomas Richardson entered upon his long and faithful pastorship in 1585.[2] The reward was probably too meagre to attract members of the Windsor chapter. The remaining clerically-owned advowson was that of St. Leonard Shoreditch, held by the archdeacon of London. The choice of incumbents reflects the influence of the bishop,[3] but Archdeacon Mullins may himself have deserved the credit for introducing the well-known,- in some

---

1. This was John Bateman who had served in City curacies and lectureships before his preferment (GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.] - sub St. Alban Wood St.)
2. P C. there 1585-c.1608.
3. e.g. Robert Chark was an episcopal protégé.

circles, notorious[1], Meredith Hanmer to London ecclesiastical society.

Four livings were held by collegiate patrons. At least one of the incumbents presented to St. Alban Wood Street by the provost and fellows of Eton College was an episcopal nominee.[2] Lancelot Andrewes, emerging in the 1590s, as one of the dominant figures on the London ecclesiastical scene, was responsible for the presentation of another, - John Jackson, a Cambridge bachelor of divinity, who had for a time served as curate to Andrewes at St. Giles Cripplegate.[3] Oxford University had a solitary presentative interest in the City through Balliol College, the impropriate rector of St. Lawrence Jewry. Both the incumbents presented by the master and fellows were Balliol men, but any possibility of preserving the living for internal students was frustrated by the collegiate policy of periodically selling the advowson to others pro hac vice. Cambridge, the nursery of so many London incumbents, owed its representation among the patrons to the post-dissolution changes. The comfortable rectory of St. Mary Abchurch was granted by the Crown who had appropriated it on the dissolution of Corpus Christi, Pountney, to Corpus Christi College in 1568, at the request of Archbishop Parker.[4] Like Balliol, the collegiate -

---

1. A.L.Rowse, The England of Elizabeth (1950), 419.
2. i.e. George Dickens, chaplain to Aylmer.
3. GLMS. 7673/1, f.119v.; Addit. MS. 12,222, f.95r.
4. Henn. 296.

authorities could not resist the temptation to grant the advowson temporarily to others. A similar policy was followed by Magdalene College, patrons and rectors of the small perpetual curacy of St. Katherine Cree, who in fact let out the impropriation to the parishioners on a ninety-nine year lease.[1] The poverty of the cure made it unattractive to all but the least-qualified until the last decade of the century.

To summarise, about 55% of the London livings were directly in the gift of clerical patrons, who also exerted unofficial pressure on selections made to a number of others. Primarily a conservative force, they constituted a formidable bulwark in the defence of the ecclesiastical establishment. Academically, their influence on the quality of the clergy was generally beneficial. A minor loophole was the practice, very rare among members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but more prevalent among the handful of collegiate patrons, of losing control of their advowsons by temporary grants to private persons.[2]

(b) Lay Patrons.

Crown Pre-eminent was the Crown, the principal beneficiary of the re-distribution of patronage at the dissolution of the monasteries. Many of the advowsons appropriated by Henry VIII

---

1. Ibid. 117.
2. Infra, pp. 280 et seq

were almost immediately re-granted, mostly to private laymen, and further alienations took place periodically during the Elizabethan period. The presentative right in the rectories of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey and St. Mary Somerset were sold by Elizabeth to two laymen in 1560,[1] and that of St. Mary Abchurch was granted to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge a few years later.[2] Losses were also incurred by the sale of impropriations, including the advowson, by the Crown, although the latter right was sometimes reserved. The donation to the perpetual curacy of St. Botolph Aldgate may have been yielded by the Crown on its lease of the impropriation in 1577.[3] Similar grants of the impropriation were made to the parishioners of St. Lawrence Pountney and St. Mary Aldermanbury during the course of the reign, but the Crown still occasionally donated to the latter.[4] At St. Stephen Coleman Street, a Crown vicarage that had been vacant for over thirty years, the parishioners in 1590 purchased both the impropriation and the advowson.[5]

Financial exigency was doubtless responsible for the alienation of Crown impropriations, a tendency most apparent in

---

1. Calendar of the Patent Rolls, 1558-60 (1939), 315.
2. Henn. 296.
3. Newcourt, i, 308. The farmer of the rectory certainly held the donation in 1597 (GLMS. 9234/6, f.279v.).
4. P.C. Carter, History of St. Mary the Virgin Aldermanbury (1913), 6.
5. GLMS. 4457/2, f.18r.

the 1590s, and which was to become a feature of James I's financial policy.[1] Nevertheless, the Queen in 1603 still retained presentative or donative interests in eighteen London livings. Moreover, she exercised her prerogative to present to benefices during an episcopal vacancy;[2] following the promotion of the previous incumbent to a bishopric;[3] and by lapse, if bishop and archbishop had failed to fill the vacancy within a prescribed period.[4] Lunacy, deprivation for simony, and the minority of patrons were other grounds for a Crown presentation.[5]

Crown beneficies valued at £20 of less in the Valor were the responsibility of the Lord Chancellor. Nicholas Bacon employed a registrar to deal with them;[6] in the Jacobean period there were two secretaries in the department.[7] The great majority of Crown livings fell into this category, including all the eighteen in the City.[8] Six were in the £10 - £15 class,

---

1. cf. Chapter VII, sub Impropriations.
2. Henn. 113.
3. Ibid. 90.
4. Ibid. 101.
5. The Crown presented to St. Mary Somerset in 1585 because of the lunacy of the patron (GLMS.9531/13,f.22r.); to St. Clement Eastcheap in 1606 following a deprivation for simony (Bodl. MS. Tanner 179,f.104r.); to St. Andrew Wardrobe in 1570 because of the minority of the patron, the Earl of Rutland (GLMS. 9531/13, f.175r.)
6. Lansd. MS. 443, f.74r.
7. J.Spedding, Lord Bacon's Life and Letters (1861), vi,336.
8. Although under £20 in value, the rectory of St. Peter in the Tower was controlled not by the Chancellor but by the Queen, as it was a royal peculiar (eg. Lansd. MS. 444, f.19r.)

and four rectories and two perpetual curacies were worth less than £10 a year. Their poverty to some extent offset the influence that the Crown, by its numerical weight, appeared to exert in London. Indeed, so meagre were some of the emoluments that the Chancellor was unable to fill the vacancies in the time of clerical dearth in the early part of the reign. St. Nicholas Acon was vacant from 1558-70,[1] St. Benet Sherehog from 1555-1578,[2] and St. Stephen Coleman Street appears to have been without an incumbent from 1561-94.[3] As Crown livings did not fall into lapse,[4] the patron could not be subjected to the normal forms of ecclesiastical censure to present.

The calibre of incumbents was inevitably affected by the low valuation of livings. Not until post-1580 when the supply of graduate clergy improved, was it usual to find a university-trained incumbent in the majority of the Crown livings.[5] The absence of more than two or three substantially-endowed benefices that might attract the ablest men, and the decline in the number of those directly dependent on him for preferment, made the Lord Chancellor particularly susceptible to the requests of

---

1. Henn. 144.
2. Ibid. 387; Lambeth MS. Tenison 711,19. Nicholls is named as rector in 1576 by Hennessy, but no record of his institution exists, and he was only the curate in 1574 (GLMS. 9537/3 no fol
3. Two or three were presented during this time, but they do not appear to have been instituted (Henn. 385). See Appendix A.
4. Burn, iii, 360-1.
5. Supra, pp. 89-90.

outsiders. Chief of these, as we have seen, was the bishop of London, but he was only one of a large variety of patrons pleading for the preferment of their candidate. The support of Dr. Huick, the vicar-general, and as such a man of much influence in the diocese, was often invoked in the 1560s, as was that of the archdeacon of London and dean of St. Paul's.[1] Parochial clergy whose official status evidently bore no relation to their range of influence, sometimes acted as sponsors; Robert Crowley, Percival Wiburn, William Gravett, and John Fox were among the London ministers who commended nominees to the Lord Chancellor in the early part of the reign.[2] Graduate candidates often bore a testimonial from their collegiate authorities.[3] Others were backed by peers, knights, and other ranks who were entitled to retain chaplains.[4] City aldermen and public officers also appeared as sponsors,[5] but not all candidates were able to draw on such august support. A recommendation from the parishioners of the parish was sometimes obtained, particularly if the nominee had already served there as an assistant curate.[6] Thomas Franklyn, presented to the impoverished rectory of St. Mary Staining in 1559, had

---

1. Lansd. MS. 443, ff.83v., 119r., 183v.
2. Ibid, ff.227r, 126v, 239v,200v.
3. Ibid, ff.182v, 233v.
4. Ibid. ff.93v, 96r., 137r., 168r.
5. Ibid. ff.219v, 239v.
6. Ibid, f.86r.

no other testimonial than the "...petitionem ipsius Thomas."[1]

How formal were these testimonials,- or petitions and recommendations as they were generally described? The support of collegiate authorities may not have been more than common form, but the variety of sponsors, and the number of candidates who turned to the bishop, the most influential man in the diocese, for support, suggest that it was regarded as worth while to bear as imposing a signature as possible to a testimonial. This did not mean that the Chancellor merely rubber-stamped the nomination of others; acceptance of the candidate might depend on the value of the living, the integrity of the Chancellor and his officials, and the quality of the nominee as well as the status of the petitioner. During Nicholas Bacon's tenure of office, the dearth of available clergy probably obliged him to accept all sorts of candidates, and explains why some were presented without any testimonials from others. Standards improved as competition increased; Puckering's reputation was not enhanced by his choice of clergymen,[2] but many were the beneficiaries of Egerton's more enlightened approach, who afterwards sung his praise. "Out

---

1. Ibid. f.83r.
2. He was thus summed up by Camden; "...though he were himself a sincere and upright man, yet, by reason of the Briberies and Corruptions of his Serv nts in selling of Church-livings, had no good Report among the Church-men" (W.Camden, The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth (1688),528).

of his own private Purposes and Practice," Hacket declared, "he disposed such livings as he gave, that some might have single Coats that wanted them, before others had Doublets."[1] The presentation lists testify to Egerton's concern for a graduate and a preaching ministry; not one of his London candidates between 1596-1603 was without a university degree. Similar discretion was observed by Francis Bacon who claimed that he made "...choice of men rather by care and inquiry, than by their own suits and commendatory letters."[2]

The variety and degrees of sponsors give some indication of the influences at work behind a presentation. Such dependence on the nomination of outsiders made impossible any consistency in policy on the part of the Lord Chancellor, and clergymen of many shades of opinion were found in Crown livings. Several radicals in the 1560s were supported in their claims by Grindal, Nowell, or the archdeacon; later, their sponsors were generally peers and others sympathetic with their cause. Lord Gray, for instance, petitioned on the behalf of the ardent Puritan, James Style, for the rectory of St. Margaret Lothbury in 1573;[3] John Downham's suit for the vicarage of St. Olave Jewry in 1599 was backed by William Davison.[4] On the

---

1. Quoted by Jean S. Wilson, The Administrative Work of the Lord Chancellor in the Early Seventeenth Century (Ph.D. London, 1927), 46.
2. Spedding, op.cit. vi, 173.
3. Lansd. MS. 443, f.208v.
4. Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.42v.

other hand, Henry Caesar, described as the first Anglo-Catholic, was presented to a Crown living in 1596.[2] Semi-conformists probably found more scope in Crown livings than those held by ecclesiastical patrons, but even so, their numbers were inconsiderable post-1570.

City Patrons. Altogether, nine London livings were shared between the Lord Mayor and his corporation, the governors of St. Bartholomew Hospital, and various City companies. The governors and the mayor jointly presented to the vicarages of Christ Church and St. Bartholomew Less, both of which parishes had been created on the foundation of the hospital in 1546. Two others had long been in the gift of the City corporation; the remainder were held respectively by the Grocers (two), Drapers, Merchant Taylors, and Mercers' companies. Citizens, by virtue of public positions they held, had therefore a fairly substantial voice in the choice of the London ministry.

The companies appear to have been more jealous of their rights than the corporation. No records exists of temporary alienation of their advowsons; the tendency, rather, was to prefer kinsmen of the members of their own company. Two, - possibly three -, of the incumbents of St. Martin Outwich were sons of merchant-taylors or mercers,[3] while other candidates for

---

1. A.L.Rowse, Tudor Cornwall (1941), 336.
2. Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.8v.
3. Withers, Bright, and perhaps Taylor. The living was held by the Merchant Taylors.

company livings were London-born men whose fathers may well have been connected with the company.[1] The presence of three of Grindal's protégés among the incumbents suggests that his voice may on occasion have been influential,[2] but on the whole the companies appear to have been as self-centred in their selections as, in a different sphere, were the dean and chapter of St. Paul's. Nor did they show much favour for radical ministers at this time; only Philpot at St. Michael Cornhill suffered deprivation for nonconformity.

The City corporation was more susceptible to outside pressure, doubtless because of the benefits that could be expected from granting favours to influential notables. Ecclesiastical dignitaries in particular showed interest in the lucrative rectory of St. Peter Cornhill, and Grindal secured the nomination on at least three occasions.[3] St. Margaret Pattens, poorly endowed, was much less easy to fill, and the mayor and his aldermen were generally ready to accede to the petitions of parishioners, whose custom was to nominate a local man.[4] The parishioners of Christ Church were equally persistent, and only to a degree less effective, in their suits. Thomas Gattacre and John Bell were both presented at their behest,[5] but

---

1. e.g. Tripp (St. Stephen Walbrook).
2. i.e. Bendall and Wright (Walbrook); Philpot (St. Michael Cornhill).
3. LMCRO. Rp16, ff.74r., 151v., 247r.
4. Ibid. f.422r.
5. St. Barts. Hospital, Ha 1/2, ff.130v., 163r.

earlier in the reign the presentation went to Thomas Beacon despite a cross-petition by Grindal.[1] Beacon's sponsor was Robert Dudley, too influential to risk offending. Despite its small income, the vicarage of St. Bartholomew Less was also on occasion competed for. In 1576, for instance, Thomas Marbery "...whome Mr. Ffox mynystar hath written for," was promised the presentation if the existing vicar, who had been suspended for immorality, were deprived.[2] Shortly afterwards, another - "...knowen to be an able man for dischardginge of the Cure there" -, made a similar suit, and was provisionally allowed the presentation if Marbery should not be qualified.[3] Eventually, all the activity proved fruitless, for the vicar's suspension was relaxed. arbery was somewhat compensated by being appointed Hospital er.[4]

The influence of local inhabitants behind presentations was evidently more far-reaching among lay patrons than their ecclesiastical colleagues. Paradoxically, the consequences were both conservative and radical. The preference for local-born candidates sometimes meant that academic standards suffered; two of the handful of incumbents who held no degrees at the end of the century were beneficiaries of local pressure

---

1. LCRO. Rep.14, ff.210v., 245v.
2. St. Barts. Hospital, Ha.1/2, f.138r. For details of the vicar's suspension see LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.125r.
3. Ha 1/2, f.138r.
4. Ibid. f.175r.

groups.[1] On the other hand, such groups sometimes showed a preference for Puritan-minded clergymen. John Gough at St. Peter Cornhill, Reginald West at St. Margaret Pattens, Henry Atkinson at St. Bartholomew Less, and Thomas Beacon and Thomas Gattacre at Christ Church were all at some time in trouble for their nonconformist scruples.[2] The most ardent of the Puritans was undoubtedly Nicholas Standen who owed his preferment to S. Margaret Pattens to the canvassing of the parishioners.[3] They first paid off the existing curate in order to secure his services, and when the living fell vacant, they secured his nomination by the patron, the Lord Mayor.[4] Citizens were sometimes less interested in academic qualifications than in a minister whose sermons were not hamstrung by hierarchical fiats.

Private Patrons. Excluding those livings in the gift of parochial representatives, sixteen were held by private individuals in 1603. Not all were post-Reformation appropriation - the origins of lay patronage lay deep in the medieval system of endowing benefices -, but the dissolution of the monasteries was responsible for the bulk of the lay patrons in London by the Elizabethan period. Services to the Crown were often rewarded by the grant of an advowson. The Wriothesley family

---

1. i.e. John Lysby and William Worrell, successively rectors of St. Margaret Pattens.
2. cf. Chapter X.
3. GLMS. 4570/2, p.46.
4. LCRO. Reg.15, f.436v.

thus obtained the presentative right at St. Andrew Holborn following the dissolution of the convent of St. Saviours, Bermondsey, as well as that at St. Peter West Cheap.[1] Lord Dudley was granted the patronage of St. Dunstan West by Edward VI.[2] Henry VIII gave the advowson of St. Mary Woolnoth to a prominent citizen, Sir Martin Bowes, and that of St. Swithin to the Earl of Oxford.[3]

In the Elizabethan period the Crown was less ready to forfeit its presentative rights to private individuals, and only two such grants are believed to have occurred in London.[4] The drying up of this source may partly account for the frequency with which private patrons sold their advowsons to others, and for the tendency to regard a presentative right as a commercial investment. Exchanges in perpetuity were less common than grants pro hac vice or for a period of years, a practice that gave opportunity to the newly-rich urban classes to enter the ranks of patrons, even if only in a temporary capacity. Where the advowson was so liable to change hands, confusion over the legitimate patron inevitably developed, and many were the disputes that arose between contending claimants.[5]

---

1. Henn. 89,437.
2. Ibid. 137.
3. Ibid. 314, 389.
4. They were the advowsons of St. Mary Somerset and St. Nicholas Cole Abbey (Calendar of Patent Rolls, 315.)
5. Infra, pp. 291-8

Peers of the realm were responsible for the incumbents of five livings, but on several occasions abnegated their duties by temporary alienation of their advowsons. Typical were the activities of the Southampton family who presented to t. Andrew Holborn and St. Peter West Cheap: pnly two of the eight Elizabethan incumbents were put in by the true patrons, the others being all preferred by temporary holders of the advowsons.[1] Lord Rich was an exception, preserving the patronage of St. Bartholomew Great in his own hands.[2] Although he alone among these peers was to any extent associated with the Puritan faction, his nominees bore no distinctive radical flavour. The absence of Puritan sympathisers like the Earls of Bedford, , Huntingdon, and Leicester, among the London patrons was one reason for the weakness of clerical Puritanism in the City.

As with peers, so with humbler lay patrons the frequent exchange of advowsons destroyed any possibility of a consistent policy with regard to presentations. The quality of the incumbents varied according to the motives behind the purchase of the advowsons. Citizens sometimes purchased a temporary presentative right in order to find a living for a son or a kinsman. William Silliard obtained the advowson of St. Mary Islington pro hac vice in order to present Anthony Silliard.[3]

---

1. Henn. 90, 437-8.
2. Ibid. 101.
3. GLMS. 9531/13, f.158r.

The fishmonger Henry Sledd preferred his son to the rectory of St. Katherine Coleman in similar fashion.[1] Inevitably, some nondescript clergymen obtained livings by this practice, - James Taylor, rector of St. Andrew Hubbard, is a ready example[2] -, but many of these temporary patrons, particularly in the wealthier parishes, put some stress on the quality of their candidates. Thomas Staller, for instance, a doctor of divinity at Oxford, was preferred to St. Mary Hill by a London grocer;[3] John Childersey, a man of equal academic distinction, owed his incumbency at St. Mary Woolnoth to the purchasing power of a group of citizens composed of a draper, merchant-taylor, and four goldsmiths;[4] the diarist, Thomas Earl, was presented by a grocer who had bought the advowson for one turn.[5] The significance of the emergence of a group of private patrons in London lay not so much in the type of incumbent they installed, - academic qualifications were certainly no worse than those in Crown livings -, but in their tendency to traffic their advowsons. This gave an opportunity to the commercial classes of London, hitherto largely unrepresented, to have some voice in clerical activities in the City. In other words, it

---

1. Ibid. f.236.v.
2. Presented by a yeoman, Taylor was a non-graduate, non-preacher, and for most of his incumbency, a non-resident (GLMS. 9531/13, f.147r.).
3. Ibid. f.170r.
4. Ibid. f.320r.
5. Ibid. f.134v.

hastened the tendency, discernible in so many spheres, towards greater lay participation in, and control over, ecclesiastical affairs.

Parochial Patrons. By the end of the Elizabethan period, the parishioners of six London livings had secured the right to appoint their own minister. In several other parishes, they temporarily enjoyed the presentative right, and their unofficial pressure elsewhere on nominally independent patrons, was, as we have seen, a feature of the age. Unofficial influence may well have been a long-established custom, but the purchase of the advowson on the parochial behalf was a novel development rich in its implications. A disguised form of congregational election was the ultimate end of lay efforts to control clerical activities.

The first advowson to be so appropriated was probably that of St. Michael Wood Street, which before the dissolution had belonged to the abbot of St. Alban's. Henry VIII sold the presentative right to one William Burwell who resold to certain persons in trust for the parish. John and Thomas Marsh, perhaps the surviving trustees, presented during the Elizabethan period. With this exception, parochial control over the advowson was confined to impropriated livings. This was due to Crown policy of periodically disposing of impropriations in return for ready

---

1. Henn. 236.

cash. Citizens were not slow to appreciate their opportunities. At St. Mary Aldermanbury, the rectory and advowson was granted in 1542 to certain persons in trust for the parishioners by a lease which was subsequently renewed from time to time.[1] Ministers were appointed by the vestry who also arranged the terms of their salaries.[2] The Crown did not completely surrender its donative right, for in 1591 a curate was appointed at the request of the Lord Treasurer.[3] A new lease made in 1604 in fact reserved the advowson to the Crown, and not until 1621 were the parishioners able to purchase outright both rectory and advowson at a cost of £440.[4]

Three other small perpetual curacies came into the possession of parishioners during Elizabeth's reign. At St. Lawrence Pountney the rectory was let out to parochial representatives from 1561 onwards, but in 1591 it was sold, along with the advowson, to two private speculators who seven years later conveyed all the appurtenances to a number of parochial trustees at an annual fee-farm rent of £4. 6. 9 to the Crown.[5] The donation to the perpetual curacy of St. James Clerken ell, at one time belonging to the Clerkenwell priory, appears to have been granted by the Crown to the parishioners

---

1. Ibid. 298.
2. GLMS. 3570/1, ff.6r., 22r.
3. Ibid. f.30r.
4. Carter, op.cit. 7-8.
5. H.B.Wilson, A History of the Parish of St. Lawrence Pountney (1831), 75.

before 1598.[1] In the Minories, the parishioners appointed their minister from early in the reign. Nothing more strongly illustrates the significance of parochial proprietorship than the terms of agreement made between the vestry of the Minories and a prospective minister in 1597.[2] The agreement was nothing less than a contract, arranging details of service and salary, and providing safeguards against defection by either party. Lay control over ministerial appointments could hardly be taken further within the existing framework of the Anglican church.

The most important advowson to fall into the hands of the parishioners was probably that of the populous vicarage of St. Stephen Coleman Street. A Crown impropriation since the dissolution of the convent of Buley, Suffolk, it remained for thirty years destitute of an incumbent. Negotiations for an outright purchase of rectory and advowson were commenced with the Exchequer in 1590, and letters patent were made out to parochial trustees, granting the sale of the rectory at thirty years purchase, and the advowson at four years purchase of the vicarage.[3] Total costs amounted to about £350, obtained by loans from certain parishi ners and others.[4] Parish property

---

1. W.J.Pinks, The istory of Cl rkenwell (1865), 32.
2. E.M.Tomlinson, A Hi tory of the inories (1907), 198.
3. GLMS. 4457/2, f.18r.
4. Ibid, f.22r.

amounting to £182 was sold to help pay off the loan, but the beneficial effects of the transaction were not long delayed. The vestry was able to divert part of the impropriated revenue to double the ministerial salary, the result being that in 1597 there were five suitors for a vicarage that had remained vacant for three decades.[1] Parochial proprietorship was clearly a factor behind the improvement in the quality of incumbents of impropriated livings.

Elsewhere, the influence of parishioners behind the selection of incumbents was frequently apparent, if less direct. The parishioners of St. Margaret Lothbury, dissatisfied with their rector, decided to appeal to the bishop for his deprivation, and at the same time to sue the Lord Keeper, the patron, "...for the revarsyon of the vowson to the paryshe."[2] The patrons of Christ Church and St. Margaret Pattens, as has been seen, paid close attention to the views of parochial representatives. Among Crown livings, parishioners sometimes appeared as sponsors of candidates; William Living was presented to St. Bride "...ad petitionem parochianorum", as was Robert Smith, instituted at St. Nicholas Acon in 1600.[3] Occasionally, parishioners managed to secure a temporary right

---

1. Ibid, f.48v.
2. GLMS. 4352/1, f.27r. (June 12th, 1575).
3. Lansd. MS. 443, f.86r.; Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.47v.

to present, by purchasing the advowson for a turn or period of years. The inhabitants of St. Lawrence Jewry, a radically-minded community, in particular exploited the readiness of the patron, Balliol College, to alienate its advowson pro hac vice. An attempt was made in 1567 "...to by the Vowson for suche some of money as they colde that the parishioners with the Assent of the byshope myght nomynayt Some onest man to theyr lykyng."[1] Unsuccessful on that occasion, as the advowson pro hac vice had already been granted to two fellows of Balliol, further efforts were made in 1571 and 1575. On the latter occasion, the Master of Balliol declared himself content that the parishioners should appoint the vicar 'for this time'; "Whereuppon in going to election by holle generall consente of the Vestery Mr Crowley was Eleckted and Chosen to be vicker."[2] Crowley was the veteran nonconformist who had been unbeneficed since his deprivation in 1566 from two London livings. In 1587, the parish purchased a lease of the impropriation, including the presentative right on the next two vacancies, for £360.[3] The first vacancy fell in 1594, and four candidates were nominated.

"The sayd parsones being put In Elecktione by XLVIII of the sayd paryshoners, by Consent of XXXVIII of the Aforesayd

---

1. GLMS. 2590/1, p.25.
2. Ibid. 51.
3. Ibid. 87. The sum was obtained by a rate levied on parishioners.

they have Chosen Mr. Searchefeld to be ther Vicker by Generall Conseant."[1]

Searchfield was not presented, however, for Balliol disputed the right of the parishioners to appoint, and successfully presented its own candidate.

This was congregational election in its most democratic form,[2] with trial sermons by candidates, and free voting by the householders of the parish. It was a practice already fashionable in London with regard to the appointment of parish lecturers,[3] but its translation to the choice of incumbent was an innovation of much significance in the development of clerical/lay relations. Ministerial status was further subordinated; the lay attitude towards an incumbent who had been appointed by a congregational vote, was less likely to be reverential than critical. On the other hand, the minister was more likely to be appointed on his merits, particularly where there was competition for the incumbency, as at St. Lawrence Jewry and St. Stephen Coleman Street. Michael Salford was accepted by the parishioners of St. Mary Aldermanbury because he was "...a man both fitt to preach and also to read the service."[4]

---

1. Ibid. 102.
2. Searchfield was given £5 for his sermon and attendance "... in hoppe of a further preferment" (ibid. 105).
3. cf. Chapter VIII, pp.408 ff.
4. GLMS. 3570/1, f.22r.

Lay control in endowed vicarages was only partial, for the incumbent's security was safeguarded by his freehold status. The position was different in the donative curacies where the patron could both appoint and remove without ecclesiastical intervention. Where the donation was in the gift of the parishioners, - as in four London parishes in 1603 -, the minister had only limited safeguards against the whims of the congregation. The minister of St. Mary Aldermanbury was dismissed in 1590 following complaints that "...he hath not exercised the office in his own person but by deputes."[1] How dangerous a problem were these enclaves to become when the whims of citizens took an anti-episcopal turn!

Such a situation was no more than latent in Elizabethan London. In the first place, only a handful of advowsons were in parochial control. Their number increased during James I's reign, as the Crown sold more of its impropriations. The parishioners of All Hallows Staining secured a lease of their rectory in 1620.[2] A private impropriator, Sir George Moore, granted the rectory estate of St. Anne Blackfriars, including the advowson and burial ground, to parish trustees in 1607 for £120.[3] The advowson of the wealthy rectory of St. Mary Hill was purchased by the parish vestry for £700 in 1637.[4]

---

1. Ibid. f.28r.
2. A. Povah, The Annals of St. Olave Hart Street and All Hallows Staining (1894), 321.
3. Endowed Charities (County of London), (1897), vi, 95-6.
4. Ibid. 487.

By that date thirteen City livings were altogether in the gift of the parishioners, either by purchase or lease of the advowson, most being vicarages or curacies.[1] The number of advowsons in their control by the 1630s gave parishioners an influence that they had never enjoyed in the Elizabethan period.

Secondly, there were only intermittent traces of Puritan feeling behind appointments made by citizens pre-1603. Some parishes were more radical than others, and there can be little doubt that the efforts made by the parishioners of St. Lawrence Jewry and Holy Trinity Minories to control appointments, were motivated by their anxiety to install Puritan ministers. Elsewhere, however, there was little sectarian feeling behind the choice of minister, the patrons being more concerned with his ability to teach and preach effectively than with his radical associations. The trend towards parochial proprietorship can be attributed to a desire for congregational independence and secular control over ministerial appointments more than to an effort to install Puritan clergy at this time. Not until parochial patrons developed consistent anti-episcopal opinions did these enclaves become a serious threat to the

---

1. CUL. MS. Mm. 6/61. cf. Hill, 58; the extra living quoted by him was St. Olave Southwark.

Anglican establishment.[1]

(ii) THE ADVOWSON MARKET

"Being their own, they may do with them as they list", declared Henry Burton of a patron's right to dispose of his advowson as he willed.[2] This was not absolutely accurate, as canons restricted the free alienation of their presentative rights by ecclesiastical patrons.[3] The lay patron, however, could sell or let out his advowson like any other property right. Elizabethan London provided a highly favourable market for such transactions. The holder of an advowson was in a position to profit both socially and financially. A presentative right, particularly to a living comfortably enough endowed to arouse clerical competition for its incumbency, was a mark of social influence in itself; it was a useful counter in the endless game of patronage, bringing notice on the owner, often producing a reciprocal reward or favour. It was a social asset dear to many Londoners, first-generation citizens who had accumulated more wealth than influence in the capital. Social climbers, kinsfolk of aspiring clergymen, radically-inclined

---

1. Such a situation existed in Caroline London when parochial patrons preferred some of the leading nonconformists of the day; e.g. J.Davenport was V. of St. Stephen Coleman St.; J. Preston P C. of St. James Clerken ell; Th. Gouge P C. of St. Anne Blackfriars; Ed. Calamy P C. of St. Mary Aldermanbury. Hill has called St. Stephen Coleman St. the 'Fauborg St. Antoine' of the English Revolution (p.255).
2. Quoted by Hill, 58.
3. Infra, p.281a

citizens, all had their reasons behind the acquisition of an advowson. Others employed an advowson as an investment; its commercial value was substantial in a seller's market. Nor, if we are to believe contemporary critics, did patrons deny themselves the opportunity of profiting from conditional, and illicit, grants of a presentation to amenable clergymen.

An outright sale of an advowson by the original post-dissolution patron was uncommon, being mostly confined to Crown impropriations; the need for ready cash was doubtless responsible for the royal readiness to alienate its advowsons in perpetuity. A Stuart commentator spoke of four to five years' purchase as the price of an advowson, though he had heard of as much as ten years' purchase being asked.[1] The four years' purchase price, - with tenths deducted -, paid by the parishioners of St. Stephen Coleman Street to the Crown in 1590 could therefore be considered reasonable, particularly as the price was assessed according to the official, not the actual value of the living.[2] The fact that it was sold simultaneously with the impropriation, - which fetched £300 at thirty years' purchase -, may have accounted for the low price. The advowson of the wealthy rectory of St. Mary Hill was purchased by the parishioners in 1637 for £700, a sum that

---

1, Hill, 58.
2. GLMS. 4457/2, f.18r.

represented nearly twenty years' purchase on the Valor valuation, and a little over forty years' purchase on the real income.[1]

Much more fashionable were temporary grants of the advowson, made for a life, a period of years, or, - most common -, for one turn (pro hac vice). Initiative in this respect on the part of ecclesiastical patrons was somewhat restricted by the statute of 1559 forbidding bishops from making leases for more than three lives or twenty-one years, and that of 1571 extending the ban to grants made by cathedral chapters and colleges.[2] More explicitly, a canon in 1571 forbade the sale of the next presentation by a bishop, fearing the possible simoniacal consequences.[3] Two of the principal clerical patrons in London, the archbishop of Canterbury and the dean and chapter of St. Paul's, appear to have remained aloof from the practice, probably because their livings were needed to reward their own protégés. Grindal and Sandys also retained control of their presentative rights, the latter declaring himself in favour of the prohibition of all such grants by bishops and cathedral chapters.[4] Aylmer was less altruistically minded, and despite the 1571 canon, made temporary grants of several of his advowsons in his declining years. A Puritan

---

1. VE. i, 376; Dale, 115.
2. Statutes of the Realm (1819), iv, 544-5 (13 El.c.10).
3. Card. Synod, i,127.
4. The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, ed. J.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1842), 434.

critic, probably Robert Beale, accused Aylmer of having granted away thirty livings before 1584,[1] but not until 1587 did he alienate a City advowson. His chaplain, George Dickens, was the beneficiary, who in turn re-granted to William Hill, citizen and innholder. The latter presented Michael Hill, doubtless a relative, if not a son.[2] The presentative right to St. Katherine Coleman was passed by Aylmer to a City gentleman "pro unica et proxima vacatione", who sold to Henry Sledd, a fishmonger who presented his own son.[3] The following incumbent was presented by Abraham Hartwell, Whitgift's secretary, who obtained the advowson from William Lynch, gentleman, to whom Aylmer had granted it for twenty-one years.[4] The notary, Richard Goodman, was another to secure an episcopal advowson pro hac vice.[5]

Minor ecclesiastical patrons in London, - the bishop of Worcester, the archdeacon of London -, and collegiate bodies, were no more innocent than Aylmer. The grantees almost invariably were citizens, men with money but little influence. Lay patrons, - with the exception of the Crown and public bodies in the City -, however, exploited their assets on a much bigger

---

1. The accusation is a marginal insertion in Beale's paper to Whitgift on the need for a preaching ministry (Addit. MS. 48039, f.19r.)
2. GLMS. 9531/13, f.232v.
3. Ibid. f.236v.
4. Ibid. f.253v.
5. St. Clement Eastcheap (ibid. ff249v.-250r.)

scale than their clerical counterparts; indeed, it was rare for all the incumbents of a living in private gift to be presented by the true patron. George, Earl of Shrewsbury, the patron of St. Andrew Hubbard, preferred to grant his right to others than to present himself; one beneficiary was a yeoman, another was the clergyman, Henry Howe.[1] Howe, who had served there as a curate, evidently relished the preferment, overcoming the canon that barred a man from presenting himself, by granting the advowson to a layman who presented him.[2] A similar manoeuvre is discernible behind the presentation of Robert Benson to St. Lawrence Jewry in 1570.[3]

The advowson sometimes passed through a number of hands before a presentation was made. At St. Mildred Bread Street, for instance, Thomas Earl was presented by a grocer, Christopher Coleman, who had been granted the right by Edward Wiseman, gentleman, the true patron by virtue of the assignation of the advowson to him by William Harford, of Westminster, for a period of years. Harford had obtained it from Andrew Incent, yeoman, an administrator of the goods of the clergyman, John Incent who had been granted the advowson for a term by the original patrons, the priory of St. Mary Overy, in 1534.[4] Earl was

---

1. GLMS. 9531/13, ff.147r., 280r.
2. Ibid. f.280r.
3. Ibid. f.156r.
4. Ibid. f.134v.

therefore presented at the fifth remove.

This was exceptional, but presentations at the second or third remove were quite common. At St. Nicholas Cole Abbey, Christopher Stile was presented by John Heynes, esquire, patron by grant from the cleric, John Ryder, who had obtained the advowson for one turn from the original patron.[1] The advowson of St. Mary Woolnoth, granted to Sir Martin Bowes by Henry VIII on the dissolution of the convent of St. Helen Bishopsgate, had passed to two citizens by 1590. They surrendered it pro hac vice to William Pelham of Newsted, Lincoln diocese, who almost immediately re-granted to John Gage, a London gentleman. Five years later, Gage sold it to a group of citizens who presented their nominee, a local-born clergyman.[2]

The frequency with which an advowson was purchased solely for the purpose of re-granting, is an indication of its value as a financial investment. Prices would vary according to the value of the living and the age and expectation of life of the existing incumbent; activity among speculators increased as prospects of the death or resignation of that incumbent brightened. To obtain the maximum price, the timing of the grant had to be synchronised with news of the impending vacancy.

---

1. Ibid. f.246r.
2. Ibid. ff.319v-321r.

Details of prices are unfortunately very meagre, as the grants were rarely entered in the episcopal registers. The advowson pro hac vice of the rectory of St. Mary Woolnoth, a living valued at £25 in 1535, and with a gross income of £91. 14. 0. in 1636, was purchased in 1595 for £46.[1] The price was probably a good one, as the incumbent was a veteran whose days could not be long prolonged; in fact, he survived another three years. The market price may have been lower in London than elsewhere because of the concentration of advowsons disposed of in the capital. In the diocese of Worcester, £40 was paid in 1601 for a pro hac vice advowson to a living worth £16. 12. 6½d. in the Valor; in 1616, a similar sale fetched as much as £105 in a benefice assessed at only £7. 0. 9.[2]

Trade in advowsons must have depended on reliable sources of information concerning granters, grantees, impending vacancies, and candidates for presentation. Episcopal servants and ecclesiastical court officials were most likely to possess up-to-date knowledge on these matters; proctors and public notaries in particular appear to have acted as consultative agents and middlemen to speculators. Occasionally, these officials invested in an advowson themselves, but more commonly they were the means of bringing together two parties. The notary, Justinian Johnson, was responsible for "...by the motion of

---

1. Ibid. f.320r.; VE. i,374; Dale, 124.
2. Barratt, op.cit. 382.

one Walter Horsell," another proctor -, for finding an amenable clergyman ready to accept a conditional presentation from a simoniacally-minded patron.[1]

The scene for such transactions, both of advowsons and presentations, was very often the nave of St. Paul's, the royal exchange of the clerical market. Doubtless this explained the "...accustomed walking and profane talking in time of the sermon there"[2], and the irony of the references to the "... pigeons of Poulls ... the proctors about the arches."[3] Clergymen, it was said, set up bills in St. Paul's "...to see if they can hear of some good masters, to entertain them into service."[4] Joseph Hall, later bishop of Norwich, had much to say about the Si Quis door in 1597:-

> "Saws't thou ever Siquis patch'd on Paul's Church Dore,
> To seek some vacant Vicarage before?
> Who wants a Churchman that can service say,
> Read fast and faire his monthly Homiley?
> And wed, and bury, and make Christen soules?
> Come to the left-side Alley of Sant Poules." [5]

In 1628, Paul's Walk was described as the "...market of young lecturers, whom you may cheapen here at all rates and sizes."[6]

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Examin, 1574-6, f.136r.
2. A.Anderson, A Sermon preached at Paules Cross (1581),Sig. Gii, f.1r.
3. cf. Eggram's sermon at Pauls Cross, 1566 (Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10,f.86r.).
4. The Works of John Whitgift, ed. J.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1853), iii,246.
5. J.Hall, Virgidemiarum (1597), quoted by W.S.Simpson, Chapters In the History of Old S.Pauls (1881), 249.
6. Thus described by Bishop Earle in his Microsmography (Quoted by H.H.Milman, Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral (1868),287.

According to Bishop Pilkington, "...The South Alley for Usurye and Popery, the North for Simony, and the Horse Fair in the middest for all kind of bargains..." were as well known to "... all menne as the begger knowes his dishe."[1] The north isle was the scene of Justinian Johnson's meeting with an importunate cleric in 1574. As soon as terms had been arranged, the latter hired a horse, and rode to Gorhambury, home of the Lord Keeper, "...to Mr. Kemp there whoe hath the passinge of all presentacions under the L. Keeper." Despite his haste, the minister arrived to find that the benefice had already been promised to one of Lord Hayward's chaplains.[2]

A suspicion of simony hung around many of these transactions. So secularised a commodity had an advowson become that speculators perhaps inevitably imposed financial conditions on a presentation grant. A leading critic of simony, preaching at Paul's Cross in 1604, admitted that a patron who "...usethe to marchandize his Benefice," might not know his wrong, thinking he was dealing only with a commodity.[3] Financial agreements between patron and prospective incumbent, involving the partial alienation of the revenues of a living, were obviously illicit, their illegality being confirmed by the Lambeth Articles of 1561 and the 1589

---

1. J.Pilkington, The Burnynge of Paules Church (1563),Sig.Giii
2. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1574-6, f.125r. Bartholomew Kemp was Registrar of the Crown presentations.
3. R.Fenton, A Sermon of Simonie and Sacriledge (1604), 39.

statute.[1] But no restrictions were placed on the purchase of an advowson by a layman *pro hac vice* in order to install a nominee, an arrangement that differed only in degree from an agreement made between patron and incumbent.

If we are to believe contemporary commentators, simony was the gravest ecclesiastical abuse of the day, the principal cause of the ignorance and poverty of the clergy, and of the contempt shown towards them by the rest of the community. "Livings," declared James Bisse in 1581,[2] "are not geven, they are solde as common as oysters at Byllingesgate." Details of illicit transactions are, however, as difficult for the historian to ascertain as they were for the ecclesiastical judges, coming to light normally only when an informer passed on information to the authorities and earned himself a reward for so doing.[3] Weaknesses in judicial procedure in the ecclesiastical courts further handicapped punitive action against offenders; only the minister could be put on oath, not the patron, in such cases, while the cleric could clear himself by finding compurgators to swear for him.[4] The statute of 1589, allowing cases of simony to be brought before the common law courts, made more effective action possible, and there was

---

1. Burn, iii, 350-2.
2. J.Bisse, *Two Sermons preached* (1581), 65.
3. Burn, iii, 351.
4. Hill, 66. cf. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1577-9, f.259v. for an Essex clergyman purging himself by introducing six compurgators, all of whom were ministers.

a noticeable increase in the number of incumbents throughout the country who were deprived on the grounds of simony in the last years of the reign.[1]

Among the London clergy, only Peter Fermyn, rector of St. Clement Eastcheap from 1595-1606, was deprived for being a party to a simoniacal agreement despite the oath against simony made by him, as by all rectors, before his collation.[2] Details are not known, but the living was in the gift of the bishop of London, who in 1595 was Richard Fletcher. This was not the only example of episcopal implication, indirect as it may have been, in transactions of this nature. Thomas Dane, one of Aylmer's household servants, purchased the next presentative right to an Essex rectory for £80, and installed his own nominee.[3] On the latter's departure, the presentation was claimed by the Crown on the grounds of simony, although the transaction, as far as is known, was no different from purchases pro hac vice made elsewhere.

The troubles of Roger Sims, rector of the Crown benefice of St. Nicholas Acon, were revealed in a suit brought by him against title defaulters in the parish. A defendant, excusing the non-payment of his dues before the consistory court, claimed

---

1. On such occasions, the succeeding right of presentation fell to the Crown. A large number of such presentations are recorded in Egerton's register. (Bodl. MS. Tanner 179).
2. Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.104r.
3. GLMS. 9531/13, ff.305v.-306r.

that Sims had admitted that he had paid £30 for the benefice; consequently, the defendant "...hath not accepted him nor believes him to bee the lawfull parson thearof but a simonaicall intruder."[1] Another minister, his eye to the main chance, commenced proceedings in the consistory for Sims' deprivation,[2] and went so far as to have himself presented.[3] His plans were over-sanguine, for the case was never concluded, and Sims retained his incumbency.

William Gibson suffered a less lenient fate. An assistant curate at St. Thomas Apostle in 1574,[4] he negotiated, by means of a notary who acted as an agent, for the presentation to a living in the Crown gift. An approach was made to a servant of the Lord Keeper, who had been promised an advowson by his master. A meeting was arranged in St. Paul's, and after one possibility had proved fruitless, the patron agreed to present Gibson, - after the latter had "...repayred to Mr. Godfreys and brought from thens the valuation" -,to the rectory of West Tilbury in Essex.[5] In return, Gibson agreed to let out the tithes of the living to the sponsor. "But whether it be symonye or no," declared the latter when Gibson was cited before the consistory court judge shortly afterwards, "he reserveth

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1591-4 [no fol.] (Nov.24th, 1592).
2. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1589-93, f.292v.
3. Lansd. MS. 445, f.17v.
4. GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.]
5. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1574-6, f.136r.

hymselfe to the lawe ecclesiasticall of this Realme."[1]. The official principal could hardly fail to reac that conclusion, and Gibson was sequestered.[2]

These are only fragmentary illustrations of a practice, the full extent of which may never be known. If the clergy in the 1586 convocation were correct in claiming how difficult it was "...to wring a free presentation from a lay patron"[3], they might have added that ecclesiastical patrons, not perhaps on the archiepiscopal level, but certainly among the episcopal entourage, were not entirely blameless in this respect.

The emancipation of the advowson from monastic control may well have increased simoniacal tendencies; it certainly added to administrative burdens by means of the disputes over patronage produced by the constant trafficking of presentative rights. Patrons quarrelled over their right to present, clergymen over their right to be presented. Differences were most likely to occur in livings held by private lay patrons, where there had been most trade in the advowson, but ecclesiastical livings were not entirely free from that state of confusion which allowed two claimants to the advowson to present rival candidates, or even two clergymen to be presented to the same living by the same patron.

---

1. Ibid. f.126r.
2. Lib. Act. 1579-81, f.144v. His resignation probably averted a deprivation.
3. Strype, Whitgift, i, 500.

Patrons who feared an assault on their rights, and clergymen whose presentations were questioned, very often found it prudent to appl. for a caveat from the vicar-general of the diocese. This was an undertaking that no presentation should be granted by the bishop without the knowledge of the recipient of the caveat or his proxies. By canon,- but not common-law -, a caveat was of such validity, that if any presentation were granted pending such caveat, it was void;[1] the process remained a highly convenient arrangement to prevent one claimant stealing a march upon another. All types of patrons made use of it, from the archbishop to the humblest layman. At All Hallows Barking, for instance, a caveat was entered during a vacancy in 1584 that no presentation be accepted without informing the archbishop, his registrar, or a household official.[2] Similar precautions were taken by the Lord Chancellor at St. Benet Sherehog in 1583, St. John Walbrook in 1585, and St. Mary Mounthaw in 1588.[3] Where there were two determined claimants, both sued for a caveat. The advowson of St. Mildred Poultry, appropriated by the Crown on the dissolution of the convent of St. Mary Overies, was claimed by the dean and chapter of Canterbury in 1575. Both parties put in caveats, the proxy of the latter being the curate, and that of the Crown was Thomas

---

1. Burn, i, 264.
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i, f.32v.
3. Ibid. Hamond, f.338r.; Stanhope, i, ff.81v., 251r.

Arden, a servant of the Earl of Leicester, who had perhaps been promised the presentative right by the Lord Chancellor.[1] Harmony was eventually achieved when the Crown presented the proxy of the cathedral chapter.

Episcopal rights were rarely disputed, probably because they had mostly been passed direct from the Crown to the bishop by Mary. One such advowson, however, was contested. Patronage of the rectory of St. Matthew Friday Street had passed via the Crown to the bishop from the convent of Westminster. In 1573 a caveat was granted on behalf of John King, a tallow-chandler, the holder of the advowson pro hac vice by grant from the last abbot of Westminster, dated in 1538.[2] Apart from its dubious validity in the light of the post-dissolution changes in ownership, the grant held no legality because there had been at least one vacancy between 1538-73. The bishop's collative right was not therefore seriously endangered.

Among lay patrons, confusion often resulted from arrangements made for alternative presentations by different members of the family who owned the advowson. The classic case was at St. Andrew Wardrobe, presentable in turn by three branches of the Berkeley family; in the Elizabethan period the claimants were the Earls of Rutland and Warwick. The former

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, ff.15r., 18r.
2. Ibid. Huick, f.316v.

presented two successive incumbents before another vacancy brought a counter-claim by Ambrose Dudley.[1] So obscure were the rival merits that the vestry of the parish, acting on behalf of the Earl of Warwick,[2] and "...knowing not certainly who was their Patron," called for an investigation of the episcopal registers,[3] and copies of presentations made from 1469 onwards were written into the wardens' account book. Eventually, the dispute was referred "...to learned Counsell," who decided in Warwick's favour.[4]

Arbitration may have been the remedy in many of these disputes, being doubtless quicker and cheaper than recourse to the spiritual or common law courts. At St. Lawrence Jewry, the parishioners in 1587 purchased the impropriation and the advowson for the next two turns for £360, and on the next vacancy, they made careful choice of a nominee by congregational election, and sued for a caveat on his behalf.[5] Great was their indignation to find a rival caveat entered by Balliol College, the original patrons, who presented their own candidate.[6] At first, parishioners determined to defend their right at law, and it is possible that a suit was actually commenced before the Lord Chief Justice.[7] Some months later,

---

1. Ibid. Hamond, f.315r.
2. The church-wardens paid 5/- for a caveat for Warwick (GLMS. 2088/1, f.50r.).
3. Ibid. f.51r.
4. Ibid. [no fol.].
5. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.167v.
6. Ibid. f.166v.
7. This would explain why a caveat was issued on his behalf (ibid. f.170r.)

however, parochial representatives called for a revocation of their caveat because they had reached agreement with Balliol, whose nominee was duly instituted.[1]

In a few cases, differences were too deeply rooted to be settled outside a court of law. Particularly troublesome was the advowson of St. Olave Jewry, held by the Windsor family. In 1583, Lord Windsor granted the advowson pro hac vice to Sir Richard Baker. His right was contested by Robert Collett, a City bowyer, and the dispute was brought before the vicar-general.[2] Collett claimed that the advowson had passed to him by marriage, and demanded the institution of his nominee. The judge decided to refer the question to the bishop who upheld the interest of the Windsor family.[3] Another vacancy in 1590 led to a further dispute. Lord Windsor had granted the advowson for a turn to his chaplain, Simon Cocks, and in 1590 Walter Agar a haberdasher, dwelling at the Sign of the Cradle in Cheapside, entered a caveat on the ground that he had been assigned the grant by Cocks.[4] His claim was contested in the Consistory by Andrew Windsor Esq. who produced a grant of the advowson made recently to him by Lord Windsor.[5] Evidently the later grant was the more valid, for Windsor's case was upheld, and his

---

1. Ibid. f.186v.
2. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1581-4 [no fol.]. (August 28th, 1583).
3. Henn. 356.
4. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.14v.
5. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1589-93, f.106r.

nominee instituted despite Agar's threat to seek legal remedy elsewhere - presunably in a common law court.

Such disputes formed a natural background to the advowson market. Where trafficking was so common, and presentative rights so prized, speculators could hardly be expected to surrender their most tenuous claims without a struggle. Worst to suffer were the clergymen, drawn perhaps unwittingly into these patronage disputes. Their presentation to a living might turn out invalid. Their admission might be contested, involving them in artificial competition with other clerical candidates, and in the expense of caveats, and perhaps, litigation. Their every credential was exposed to the microscopic scrutiny of informers who stood to gain from the invalidation of their presentation and institution. Did not the petition of the London clergy to convocation in 1581 reflect an aspect of this insecurity? "For as muche as no manne is in securitie whatt proffe maie serve hime for reding the articles if other his parrishioners have forgotten the same or will not testifye the same..."[1] Their protest was a sad commentary on the opportunism of the London citizen.

Disputes over patronage rights were not alone responsible for clerical insecurity. Much inconvenience was caused by the

---

1. Bodl. MS. Wood, F30-2, p.89. The articles referred to, were the 1562 Articles of Religion, which all incumbents were obliged to read out publicly in their churches twice a year.

practice of granting reversionary presentations before the living was vacant, a practice condemned by Sandys,[1] but indulged in by most types of patrons. As might be expected, it flourished most in Crown livings, for, as we have seen, the Crown was probably most susceptible to the petitions and canvassing of candidates. They usually occurred in livings where the existing incumbent was advanced in years or failing in health. Two men were presented to St. Sepulchre while the vicar was still alive;[2] neither was ultimately instituted, no doubt deciding to seek preferment elsewhere rather than remain interminably in suspense. Richard Griffith was presented to St. Nicholas Acon during the course of unsuccessful proceedings to deprive the rector.[3] The Lord Chancellor presented Francis Inman to St. James Garlickhithe sixteen years before the incumbent died, causing the latter to sue for a caveat to safeguard his interests.[4] On two occasions, secretarial inefficiency was perhaps responsible for the Chancellor's action in presenting to benefices that had long ceased to exist as separate entities.[5]

---

1. Sermons, 434.
2. Richard Vaughan (1593), Thomas Singleton (1599) (Lansd.MS. 445, ff34r., 138r.).
3. Ibid, f.17r.
4. Ibid, f.100v.; LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.140v.
5. Richard Gawton was presented in 1596 to the rectory of St. Mary Axe which had been united to St. Andrew Undershaft in 1561 (Lansd. MS. 445, f.95r.). Fogges Newton was presented in 1601 to St. Nicholas Shambles, dissolved in 1546 (St. Barts. Hospital, Ha 1/3, f.230r.). Were these fictitious presentations caused by a surfeit of clerical candidates at this time?

Confusion was by no means confined to chancellorial departments. On more than one occasion, Aylmer may have been embarrased to find that he had promised the same benefice to two clerics, neither of whom would surrender his claim without recourse to litigation. Thus, the vicar-general was obliged to settle a dispute between two of Aylmer's chaplains for the rectory of St. Christopher Stocks.[1] At St. Clement Eastcheap, another episcopal collation, a chaplain to Aylmer disputed the right of the 'pretended rector', but somewhat surprisingly, failed to replace him.[2] Episcopal chaplains were affluent enough to bear the expense of litigation, but there may have been many who, like an Essex clergyman, feared to bring their case before the bishop "...because he is poore and not hable to prosecute the lawe."[3] The clergy, we may conclude, were the class in many ways least likely to benefit from the flourishing market in advowsons, largely created by t e emancipation of presentative rights from monastic control, and which played a not insignificant part in the secularisation of clerical control and activity.

---

1. Hutchinson v. Dyos 1582 (LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1581-4 [no fol.].
2. Keltridge v. Carr 1582 (ibid.). The confusion may have been brought on by Aylmer's anxiety to reward all his numerous chaplains.
3. GLMS. 9531/13, f.306r. The minister was Thomas Beard, presented to the rectory of Rothing Aythropp.

CHAPTER SEVEN

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

The poverty of ecclesiastical livings invariably constituted a principal argument in the Anglican apologia for tolerating conditions which, to critics of the ministry, could only lend themselves to abuse and corruption. The insuffiency of clerical emolument accounted for the failure of the church to compete with more lucrative secular professions in attracting the ablest young men from the universities. This in turn explained the existing shortcomings of the clergy, their social inferiority, their educational limitations, their inability to preach. Pluralism, ran the Anglican theme, was less of an abuse than a necessary device to counteract the poverty-stricken state of livings. If ministerial deficiencies were the consequence of poverty, as offical spokesmen asserted, are we to find the clue to the high standards of the London ministry, their academic qualifications, and their even more exceptional preaching abilities, in the relatively greater prosperity of City livings?

The London clergy spared no effort to dispel such illusions. Complaints of their own unhappy condition were incessant from the time of Cranmer to that of Laud. "Wher as thouroughowt the whole realme the benefices of London ar the smalest and the ministers the porest the sheape well clad

and the pastors go naked..." began the preamble of a petition presented by the "...miserable clergie of London" to Convocation in 1581.[1] A petition sent to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere declared that "...the Benefices of London within the Walls are the poorest in the Kingdom: Compare them with the Benefices ten miles about London, and you shall find none rated as ours are in his Majesty's Books; but to be two or three Times mor Value to the Incumbents, than ours to us."[2] This discrepancy between the official and the actual values of beneficies was reiterated in a list of clerical grievances compiled in 1638, which concluded "...many have no house for the parson and to hire one costs as much as some of the Livings are worth."[3]

How can the persistent importunity of a ministry that stood unequalled in academic and pastoral distinction, be reconciled with the attribution of clerical shortcomings to the poverty of the church by Anglican apologists? Was the poverty of London livings so acute as was asserted by the clergy? If so, how far did the responsibility rest with Henrician legislators who had drawn up a tithe settlement whose inadequacies the clergy never wearied of pointing out? In short, were the ministerial grievances based on valid comparisons with the state of livings elsewhere, or coloured by their

---

1. Bodl. MS.Wood F30-2, p.86; printed in J.Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (1852), ix, 343-6.
2. The petition is included in a collection compiled by S. Brewster, Collectanea Ecclesiastica (1752), 263.
3. Dale, viii.

inability to obtain a proportionate share of the increase in the secular prosperity of London during the Elizabethan period?

(i) SOURCES OF INCOME

London was furnished with all three types of ecclesiastical living with cure of souls. Rectorial income - and the vast majority of City benefices were rectories -, was drawn from four sources; revenue from glebe land attached to the parsonage, tithes, casualties in the form of fees for baptisms, marriages, burials and churching, and the Easter offerings. Vicarial income varied according to the endowed or non-endowed status of each vicarage; the former type received a proportionate share of the rectorial income, the latter was generally placed on a stipendiary basis payable by the rector. As with rectories, the tithe income of endowed vicarages was based on rent-charges in London, and was not drawn from separate products, as was the case in the country. Disparities between the rate of increase in the values of rectories and vicarages - an acute problem in rural areas - did not therefore arise in London. Two out of thirteen vicarages appeared in practice, despite their status, to have drawn the full rectorial income;[1] of the others, at least six were on a stipendiary basis.[2] Thirteen parishes represented the third and most inferior type of livings, the

---

1. All Hallows Barking; St. Olave Jewry.
2. Christ Church, St. Bartholomew Less, St. Bride, St. Helen Bishopsgate, St. Lawrence Jewry, and St. Stephen Coleman Street.

perpetual curacy. Its rectorial income was alienated from the cure of souls by impropriators or appropriators, who apportioned an annual stipend to the minister responsible for the cure. In fact, there was no difference between a perpetual curate and the vicar of an unendowed vicarage in the stipendiary manner of their payment.

The financial position of incumbents of livings whose revenues were alienated is discussed later; here, we are concerne with rectorial income, that which belonged to the benefice rathe than necessarily to the incumbent. Glebe land normally formed an important part of this income, providing a basic source that was not dependent on parochial contributions. In the expanding London of the second half of the sixteenth century, the rent obtainable from property built on glebe land must have been a lucrative source of income. The amount of glebe available for exploitation by the Elizabethan rector is, however, ill-defined. No specification was made in the Valor Ecclesiasticus, but Brian Walton, writing a century later, declared that such property as the rector had held on the eve of the Reformation, - his parsonage, chambers in the church-yard built for the use of assistant priests , - had been largely lost, either through Crown seizure by virtue of the Statute of Chantries in 1547, or by 'sacrilegeous' invasion by parishioners.[1] His picture is

---

1. Printed by Brewster, op.cit. 2. Walton was a London incumbent of the Laudian era, who became bishop of Chester.

largely confirmed by the assessment made in 1638 by the London clergy of their annual income. Only twenty-four recorded receipts from land or property held in glebe as part of the rectorial income. In a few cases the amount was negligible, the profit being less than £10 p.a.,[1] but on the whole, glebe revenue in those parishes which retained such property, was substantial. The annual rent from the cellars and shops owned by the rector of St. Dionis Backchurch was £12. 13. 4d; at St. Peter Cornhill, it amounted to £58, at St. Dunstan in the West £70, while the rector of St. Mary Aldermary drew £96. 8. 8d. profit from his glebe, a sum that was 150% the value of his tithes in the same year.[2]

Discretion doubtless prevented Walton, who was ventilating the grievances of the City clergy, from mentioning those emoluments, but only nine rectors, it must be noted, reported glebe profits of over £20 a year.[3] The great majority of London livings possessed no glebe at all apart from, - in most but not

---

1. St. Anne and Agnes (£8.8.0d); St. Benet Sherehog (£2.13.4d); St. Botolph Bishopsgate (£1.9.4d); St. Dunstan in East (£6); St. Mary Somerset (£7); (Dale; 31,41,229,52,118).
2. Ibid. 48,178,235,108.
3. Apart from the 4 mentioned, they were All Hallows, Lombard St. (£40); St. Christopher Stocks (glebe + casuals; £32.10.0); St. Katherine Coleman (glebe + casuals £21); St. Margaret New Fish St. (£25); St. Mary Hill (glebe + casuals £42). (Dale; 16,45, 81,101).

all cases -, a parsonage house which occasionally was let out.[1]

Tithes, casualties, and offerings, constituted for over three-quarters of the London rectors, spiritual or lay, their exclusive source of rectorial income. Tithes were based on rent-charges, a property-tax virtually peculiar to London, and a form of assessment that caused as much resentment among incumbents who were subject to it as envy among rural clergy who were denied it.[2] The origin of the rent-charge lay deep in the medieval parish, regulated by papal constitutions that based tithe on a proportion of rental values.[3] Until 1535, the assessment was 3/6 in the £; in that year it was reduced to 2/9, a rate that was finally confirmed by the decree of 1546.[4] Shops - even if divided from the house of the owner -[5] warehouses, cellars, and stables, as well as houses were subject to tithe by the decree which, however, made minor connessions; the most important was to exempt the houses of "greate men, nor noble men or noble women, keepte in theyre owne handes, and not

---

1. The non-resident rector of St. Martin Ludgate in 1566 let out his parsonage house to a layman for 21 years at an annual rent of 26/8 payable to him and his successors. (GLMS. 9531/13, f.41v.). These leases made matters very awkward for successors who wished to reside.
2. cf. Hill, 285. The bishops in 1604 advocated an act of Parliament providing for tithe payment in provincial towns "... according to the house rents of the inhabitants, as it is in London."
3. cf. VCH 247-52 for details of the background of the Henrician decrees.
4. Statutes of the Realm (1817), iii; 552,998-1000.
5. Following the 1535 act, citizens had disputed whether shops that were divided from houses, were subject to tithe; this was now clarified (Brewster, op.cit. 147).

letten owte", which had not previously paid tithes. Company halls were likewise excepted, as were sub-tenants paying less than 10/- a year in rent.[1]

In a city where property was held largely on lease, specific safeguards against confusion between landlord and tenan over the responsbility for tithe payment were required. Owners who occupied their own houses paid according to their rental value when last let out. A lessee, dwelling in part of the house, and sub-letting the remainder, was responsible for the whole tithe according to the rent of each sub-tenant.[2] If he let out the whole house, the sub-tenant(s) was responsible. Precautions were taken against collusion between lessor and lessee, by authorising the Lord Mayor and his assistants to settle disputes or doubt "...upon the true knowledge or devysion of any reent or Tythes...[or] upon any other things conteyned within this Decree". If he failed to act within two months, or if the parties were dissatisfied, complaint could be made to the Lord Chancellor. No mention of the authority of the spiritual judge to settle disputes was made in the act.

The reduction of the rent-charge from 3/6 to 2/9 in the £ in 1535, a concession by the Henrician arbitrators to

---

1. In such cases, the chief lessee was to pay according to the last rent before the house was sub-let.
2. cf. the suit Badham v. Wardens of Butchers Co. 1580. The Court of Aldermen decided that as long as part of a house was le the recipient of the rent paid the tithe. (LCRO. Letter Bk. Z, f.46r.)

importunate City interests was a serious blow to clerical income, particularly at a time when many pre-Reformation casual dues, such as mortuaries, obits, and trentals, were being abolished by statute. The rectory of St. Magnus, for instance, said to be worth £100 in 1494, was assessed at £67 in the Valor Ecclesiasticus.[1] According to Brian Walton, few livings were worth less than £20 before 1535.[2]

Made relatively poorer as they undoubtedly were by the 1535 arbitration, the London clergy were still in a privileged position in relation to the rest of the country. An assessment of 2/9 in the £ was, after all, nearer to a seventh than a tenth. The high rate was intended by the arbitrators to compensate for the decline of personal tithes, the tax on business profits. Such a tithe would have proved highly lucrative in the London of Elizabeth's day, but a tradition of lay opposition that could be traced back to the early fourteenth century, had made it virtually unenforceable; the final death-knell was the statute of 1549 abolishing the use of the oath to ascertain tithe.[3] "In this whole citie yearlie there is nott 40/- yearly paide for privie [personal] tithe so that a freeholder of £4 a yeare in the countrey paieth more to the parson then a citizen worthe £100,000", lamented the London clergy in 1581, petitioning

---

1. VCH 251; VE i, 173
2. Brewster, op.cit. 26.
3. Hill; 79,90.

Convocation fruitlessly for the repeal of the 1549 statute.[1] Despite the envious glance cast at rural incomes, the decline of personal tithes was by no means confined to London, being apparent throughout the country; a 1563 paper spoke of "...the universal subtraction of privy or personal tithes", an observation confirmed by Whitgift in 1585.[2] Moreover, the London petitioners conveniently overlooked the fact that they alone had been compensated for the loss by the rate laid down in the 1535 decree.

A few of the parishes under study were not governed by the tithe assessments of 1535 and 1546, which concerned only the City. The three out-parishes, St. Leonard Shoreditch, St. Mary Islington, and St. James Clerkenwell, two of which were vicarages, and the other a perpetual curacy, paid tithe in the orthodox manner of assessment on the profits of a man's visible produce. More complex exceptions were those parishes created after the dissolution of the monastries, and set up on ex-monastic precincts hitherto exempt from the jurisdiction of the City government, and whose inhabitants denied the validity of the decree with regard to them. The problem, by-passed by the

---

1. Bodl. MS.Wood F30-2, p.86. Mullins, in his archdiaconal visitation of 1585, inquired about offenders against the statute (W.P.M.Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, Alcuin Club Collections, XXVII (1924), iii, 177
2. Hill, 91.

1546 statute,[1] left the incumbents of such livings in the vulnerable position of depending on voluntary parochial contributions, or on glebe profit, or the rent of property designated for their use.[2] Tithe at the City rate of 2/9d in the £ was levied in the Minories throughout the Elizabethan period despite the immunities claimed by the parish by virtue of its ex-monastic site,[3] but in 1638 it was declared that no tithe was paid.[4] The rector of the parish created out of the priory of St. Bartholomew, for half a century dependent on rent drawn from parish property, unsuccessfully sued a large number of inhabitants in the late 1590s on his right to demand tithe.[5] Incumbents throughout the City not infrequently found litigation the only remedy to the refusal of citizens, whose property happened to be on monastic sites, to pay tithe.[6]

Apart from glebe and tithe revenue, a minor but zealously preserved source of rectorial income came from the Easter offerings and the 'casual' fees charged for baptism, marriages, burials and churching of women. Householders paying more than

---

1. An oblique reference may have been the clause excepting parishes that had previously paid less than 2/9 in the £ from the terms of the decree (Dale, v, note).
2. St. Anne Blackfriars, St. Bartholomew Less, St. Bartholomew Great. (Brewster, op.cit. 203-7; Dale, 198).
3. E.M.Tomlinson, A History of the Minories, London (1907),192-
4. Brewster,op.cit. 207.
5. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1599-1605, passim. The plaintiff was David Dee.
6. e.g. Hutchinson (R. of St. Botolph Bishopsgate) v. Pye, 1587 (LCCRO. Lib. Exam. 1586-91, f.106r. and v.).

10/- rent a year were exempted from the former duty by the tithe decree of 1546 which laid down an annual charge of 2d. for their four offering days by other communicants within the family.[1] As it became a statutory offence in the Elizabethan period for communicants to neglect receiving the communion at Easter, the offering formed a welcome annual windfall to the rector of a populous parish. Offerings received by the church wardens of St. Andrew Hubbard, farmers of the rectorial revenues from servants within the parish amounted to 41/1d. for the period 1558-60; by 1588-90 the sum had increased to 56/-d.[2], an indication less perhaps of a population growth than of the effect of acts recently passed against those who refused to receive the Communion. At St. Stephen Coleman Street, 590 communicants contributed £4.18.4d. in offerings in the year 1593-4; in 1595 it had risen to £5.16.2d., about 15% of the tithe income for that year.[3] Individual contributions are recorded in wardens' account books in the Minories where the householder was evidently responsible for the charge of 2d. on his wife, communicant children and servants.[4] Doubtless the communion 'tokens' - receipts to those who received at Easter - which were becoming fashionable in London parishes in the later part of Elizabeth's reign,[5] facilitated rectorial ability to

---

1. Statutes of the Realm, iii, 1000.
2. GLMS. 1279/2, f.139r.
3. GLMS. 4457/2, f.41r.
4. Tomlinson, op.cit. 193.
5. VCH. 321.

exact his due offerings.

Charges for christenings, burials etc. formed a more substantial source of income in a city where birthrate and mortality rate were so high. Fees varied fairly considerably according to local usage and the parson's zeal for the utmost exaction. At St. Bartholomew the Less, regulations for the "...Reformation of Churche duties" were introduced in 1603 because recent fees were judged to be excessive.[1] The rate for christening was laid down at 1/4, of which the vicar took 10d; 1/6 of the 2/6 charged for a marriage (presumably with banns) also went into his pocket. For burials, reduced fees were available for those under twelve years of age; the vicar, for instance took 3/4 for an adult burial in the chancel of the church, 2/6 for a child less than twelve years. Subtle variations of all kinds are disclosed by the parish clerk's memoranda books of St. Botolph Aldgate. Churching fees varied according to whether the child was single, a twin, alive or still-born; the burial of a chrisom (unbaptised) baby cost more than that of a christened child.[2] The amount of burial fees depended on the place of residence of the deceased; 'foreigners' were charged more heavily than parishioners.[3] A parishioner who died at home but was buried in another parish still paid

---

1. St. Barts. Hospital, Ha.1/3, f.251v.
2. GLMS. 9234/1, ff.4r.,28v.,29r.
3. Ibid. f.65v.

duties to his native parish.[1] Sexton and clerk shared in all the 'casual' fees, but the lion's share fell to the incumbent. Details of the annual income from these charges are extremely elusive for the Elizabethan period, but some indication is given by the 1638 figures, drawn up admittedly by the clergy themselves. In many parishes only the lump sum from casualties and offerings was recorded, but at All Hallows Lombard Street, for instance, the 'casual' fees amounted to £7 a year, a fairly average figure among the less populous parishes where the tithe was under £100 a year.[2] The rector of St. Andrew Undershaft, a relatively wealthy parish with a tithe revenue of £155, drew £18 a year in fees for marriages, churchings, and burials.[3] At St. Botolph Aldgate, where the tithes were only a little short of £400, the perpetual curate received about £50 in casualties, commenting in his return that "...I may say, if people do not die I cannot live."[4]

(ii) VALUE OF LIVINGS

Few livings in London were worth less than £20 before 1535, wrote Walton a century later;[5] the Valor Ecclesiasticus compiled in that year, and assessing at the new tithe rate of 2/9 in the

---

1. cf. A. Pulling, A Practical Treatise on the Laws, Customs and Regulations of the City and Port of London (1842), 264.
2. Dale, 16.
3. Ibid. 26.
4. Ibid. 224.
5. Brewster, op.cit. 26.

£, valuated only a minority of benefices at more than £20. Ninety-three of the 111 parishes that existed in the Elizabethan period, were included in the survey; omitted were the perpetual curacies which were not technically benefices at all, and were not subject to royal taxation, the motive behind the Valor, and those livings which were only given parochial status after the dissolution of the monastries.[1] A summary of the valuation of the ninety-four livings reads:-[2]

Not exceeding		£5	:	-
"	"	£10	:	15
"	"	£15	:	16
"	"	£20	:	33
"	"	£25	:	9
"	"	£30	:	6
Over	...	£30	:	14

Mr. Mullins has warned us against the pitfalls of the Valor the difficulties of assessing rectorial income drawn from

---

1. i.e. St. Bartholomew Less, Christ Church, St. Michael Paternoster Row, St. Anne Blackfriars, St. Bartholomew Great, Holy Trinity Minories.
2. This summary is to be found in Mullins, 56. I have not included St. Mary Axe, valued at £5 in 1535, because the living, vacant on Elizabeth's accession, was united with St. Andrew Undershaft in 1562. Mr. Mullins compared London values with those of a similar number of livings in Lincoln diocese, and found that while only 18 out of 90 in the latter area exceeded £15, the London ratio was 62 out of 94.

spiritualia as well as *temporalia*, miscellaneous customary duties as well as tithes, and the possibility that livings were under rather than over-taxed.[1] Its inaccuracies for London have been emphasised by Miss Jeffreys Davis,[2] yet it remained throughout our period the official assessment for taxation and presentation purposes. Under-valued as London benefices may have been at that time, and anachronistic as the assessment undoubtedly became later in the century, the livings were, according to Walton, among the highest rated in the country.[3] If we accept Cranmer's inference in 1539 that £10 constituted a sufficient annual stipend for a learned divine,[4] only sixteen of the City benefices fell below this level, and all but four of these were assessed at £8 or over. Despite the reduction in the tithe rate, the income of London rectors appears to have given little justifiable ground for complaint at the time of the *Valor*.

---

1. Mullins, 50-1. cf. J.Hunter, *An Introduction to the Valor Ecclesiasticus* (1834), 26.
2. *VCH*. 251, note 74.
3. Brewster, *op.cit*. 26. Some comparisons are possible;-

	London	Worcester diocese	Oxford diocese
R. and V. under £5	- out of 93	15 out of 190	13 out of 163
R. and V. over £20	89 out of 93	20 " " "	13 " " "

The figures for Worcester and Oxford are drawn from Miss D.M. Barratt, The Condition of the Parish Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester, and Glougester (D.Phil.Oxford 1949), 192.
4. *Works of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. J.E.Cox, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1846), i,397.

Thirty years later, the spectacular price inflation, the greater charges borne by clergymen, now more often than not family men, the changing emphasis of their pastoral duties with the new stress on preaching, the demands for a well-qualified ministry and the difficulties encountered in ascertaining the true rent of citizens and exacting their full tithe, were fast making the 1535 valuation anomalous and unrealistic. In 1586, William Harrison, who himself had experience of a London incumbency,[1] regarded £30 a year as a minimum income for a beneficed clergyman.[2] An ambitious Puritan proposal in 1587 aimed to raise clerical salaries to £100,[3] an increase that would have been made possibly only by the return of alienated ecclesiastical income to the church. More practical was Harrison's estimate, made, be it noted, by a clergyman with cure of souls and well-versed in the problems of an incumbent's budget; his figure implied a three-fold rise in the cost of living since Cranmer's estimate of £10 in 1539. How far had the values of benefices kept up with increased costs?

Details of tithe revenue during the reign are extremely

---

1. He was very probably the William Harrison, R. of St. Olave Silver St. (1567-71), and of St. Thomas Apostle (1583-7), two of the poorer City livings. Venn (Alumni Cantab. 1,ii,318), names him as such, but it is not mentioned in the DNB. or in the foreword to the Description. Harrison left 20/- to the poor of St. Thomas in his will, dated in 1591. (Description of England, ed. F.J.Furnivall (1877),i,xv.).
2. Description of England,i,22.
3. SP. ii,209.

elusive, as the Valor remained the assessment for official purposes. In an orthodox benefice, rectorial income was normally collected by, or on behalf of, the incumbent independently of the parish, and there was no reason why its receipts should appear in the church-warden account books. Occasionally, a rector would let out his revenues to the parish, and details of income and expenditure were then recorded in the account books; this practice, favoured by non-resident rectors, was largely quashed in 1571, when a statute forbade all but resident incumbents from leasing their tithes to laymen.[1] Residents were the least likely to take such a course, and so we find very few such details in parish books post-1571. Impropriators were also excluded from the terms of the statute, and could dispose of their income as they pleased. A few of the surviving London account books belong to parishes which had either bought or leased the impropriation from the original tithe owner, the revenues of which were made the responsibility of the wardens. In one case, Christ Church, Newgate Street, the financial records of the original impropriators survive.

At St. James Garlickhithe, a rectory valued at £17.4.6d. in 1535,[2] tithes and 'church duties' (presumably offerings as well as casualties) amounted to £28.7.1d. in the year 1569-70;[3]

---

1. Statutes of the Realm, iv,556 (13 El. c.20).
2. VE. 1,374.
3. GLMS. 4810/1, f.36v.

there appears to have been no glebe attached to the parsonage.[1] The rate of increase of about 65% in the income of the living was approximately similar to that of St. Andrew Hubbard at the same time, the parson's 'duty' in that parish amounting to £46.4.4d. in the two years 1566-8.[2] More details are available for this latter benefice, for the revenues were leased out by the non-resident rector to the parishioners for almost twenty years. Assessed at £16 in 1535, the revenues came to £35.3.6d. in the two years 1552-4, an annual valuation that was still fairly close to that of the Valor.[3] Within the same dates, 7/6 was collected for the parson "...toward the fall of the mony"[4], a significant comment on the high inflationary trends of that period. Revenues aggregated £33.10.0d. for an eighteen month period in 1558-60,[5] an annual estimate of £22.6.8d; since 1554, £4.14.11d. had been added to the rectorial income. Tithe payment may have improved with the return of a Protestant monarch, and the rise in prices may have been reflected in an increase in rental values on which tithe was based. Between 1558-68 when the lease expired on the death of the incumbent,

---

1. No glebe, apart from the parsonage house, was recorded in the 1638 return (Dale, 75). The house was bought for the parson in 1589 (Endowed Charities (County of London) (1897),vi, 307).
2. GLMS. 1279/2, f.103r.
3. VE. i, 373; GLMS. 1279/2, f.65r.
4. Ibid, f.65r.
5. Ibid. f.83r.

the annual income remained fairly constant.[1] No further details are available until 1586-92 when the revenues were again leased to the parish by a non-resident rector, notwithstanding the 1571 statute.[2] Tithe and offerings - but not casualties - together came to £28.10.4d. in 1590, and only slightly less in the following two years.[3] If £4 be reasonably included for casualties, we find that the value of the benefice at this time was about double that of 1535, a rate of increase that was 33% short of that inferred from Harrison's calculation made a few years earlier.

Dissatisfaction with what he regarded as an insufficient living was the ostensible grounds for the resignation of the rector of St. Margaret Lothbury. In nine months, the incumbent protested to a vestry, he had received only £28 for his "howsekepinge".[4] Even if we accept his figure, his annual income would have amounted to £37.6.8d., approaching an increase of 200% over the valuation of £13.5.11d. laid down in 1535.[5]

---

1. An average of £23.2.0d. was collected in 1568, the last year before the expiry of the lease (ibid. f.103r.)
2. The rector was cited to reside in the 1592 episcopal visitation. He died in the following year (GLMS. 9537/8, f.82v. Henn. 307).
3. GLMS. 1279/2, ff.144v.,149v.
4. GLMS. 4352/1, f.58v.
5. VE. 1,374. The parishioners claimed he had received £34 (not £28) in tithe as well as various benevolences and loans amounting to £8. In fact, the rector's complaints appear to have been a pretext to resign the living in order to take up a Court preferment, despite the promise made on his institution to remain for six years. (GLMS. 4352/1, f.58v.)

Of the wealthiest benefices, we have only information of St. Dunstan in the East, which at £60.8.3d., was the second highest rated in the City in 1535.[1] Forty years later, tithes alone amounted to at least £100, and in 1593 were assessed at £120.[2] Taking in consideration the subsidiary windfalls from casualties and offerings, and the small amount of glebe,[3] the income of the living may be assumed to have at least doubled by the later part of the reign.

Rectorial income in impropriated livings is rather more amply illustrated, although the omissions of perpetual curacies from the 1535 assessment prevents a comparison of Elizabethan with earlier figures. The tithe received by the church wardens of St. Lawrence Pountney was just under £27 in 1576.[4] By 1584 it had increased to £31.4.2d., rising in the following year by over £5, and henceforward fluctuating for a decade between £30-35.[5] Local factors alone may have accounted for the precipitous increase within a period of twelve months and for subsequent variations; much must have depended on the choice and behaviour of parish representatives whose task it was to collect the tithe, or on the amount of pressure exerted by the incumbent. In these perpetual curacies, the alleged practice

---

1. VE. i, 370.
2. GLMS. 4887, p.275.
3. In 1638, these 'extras' came to £34 (Dale, 52).
4. GLMS. 3907/1 [no fol.].
5. Ibid. [no fol.].

among citizens of withholding tithes from an incumbent of whom they disapproved,[1] did not arise, for the tithe was paid to parochial trustees, and no more than a portion was assigned to the curate.

Tithe and offerings in the year 1558-9 in the impropriate rectory of Christ Church, Newgate Street, amounted to £66.18.7d., of which £26.13.4d. was paid to the vicar.[2] A slight increase was apparent in 1574 when the rectorial income was leased out for a period of forty years at £70 a year.[3] Seven years later, the terms of the lease were revised and the rent was raised to £80 in 1583.[4] The lay rectors - the governors of St. Bartholomew Hospital - took advantage of a dispute between claimants for the lease in the following year, to raise the rent to £96.13.4d., of which £90 was for tithes.[5] Sixteen years later, a new lease of the rectory was granted for forty years at an annual rent of £100, a sum which in 1602 was increased by £20.[6] Comparison with the £66.18.7d. received in

---

1. e.g. Walton's allegation (made about 1639) that Puritan preachers drew the citizens' money from the incumbent to themselves (Brewster, op.cit. 177).
2. St. Barts. Hospital, Hb./1/1 [no fol.].
3. Ibid. Ha/1/2, f.103v.
4. Ibid, f.197v. The revised lease was for 10 years only.
5. Ibid, f.247r. The dispute was caused by an unsuccessful attempt by influential inhabitants of Christ Church (including Thomas Fanshaw, Remembrancer of the Exchequer) to purchase the lease on behalf of the parishioners. The rent rise was doubtless the result of some fierce competitive bidding.
6. Ibid. Ha/1/3, f.241v.

1558-9 shows that the real income of the benefice had virtually doubled during the course of the reign, for the 1602 receipts must have been a little in excess of the rent charged by the rector in order to give the lessee his profit.

St. Lawrence Jewry offers the only opportunity among London livings where the rectorial income was alienated, of comparing values in later Elizabethan days with those assessed in the Valor. The vicarage in 1535 was said to be worth £18.0.6d., while Balliol College, the appropriate rectors drew £27.13.4d. a year.[1] In 1587, a lease of the rectory was purchased by the parishioners, and records of tithe receipts appeared in the account books from 1589 onwards. Tithes alone amounted to £70.10.8d. in the year 1591-2,[2] and in the following decade fluctuated between £65-£72; post-1606, they did not fall below £75. If we take into consideration the casualties and offerings - amounting to £8 in 1638[3] -, which were included in the 1535 assessment but not in our Elizabethan totals, the income of the benefice may safely be said to have increased threefold between 1535 and 1606.

These several examples, fragmentary as they may be, are fairly representative of all but the poorest London benefices. They suggest that rectorial income, still approximate to the

---

1. VE. 1, 377.
2. GLMS. 2590/1, f.58r.
3. Dale, 80.

Valor assessment at the end of Henry VIII's reign, rose sharply in the following decade and again in the 1580s until by the end of the reign values were double, and in some cases treble, those of 1535. The rate of increase was perhaps most apparent in impropriated incomes as lay rectors were generally in a better financial position to enforce the payment of tithe than their clerical counterparts. Moreover, parishioners who held the rectorial income of their impropriated livings, either through purchase or by a lease, were more likely to contribute their full tithe when they shared in controlling the disposal of the revenues.

Not until the 1638 returns does opportunity exist for a more comprehensive study of rectorial income. This is made possible by a detailed analysis by the clergy themselves of their income and expenditure, drawn up to reinforce their campaign for improvements in tithe payment.[1] As their case rested on their relative poverty compared either with clergy elsewhere or with the pre-1535 London ministry, we may assume that their income accounts erred, if at all, on the conservative side. Bearing in mind the post-1603 increase, in income, - at St. Dunstan in the East, the tithe receipts rose from £120 to £136.6.4d., from about £70 to over £80 at St. Lawrence Jewry, and at St. Helen Bishopsgate from £35.18.0d. in

---

1. This campaign is discussed at length by Hill in his chapter on Tithes in London.

1605-6 to £63.13.0d. in 1638[1], comparative figures with those of the 1535 assessment may give some indication of the increase of benefice values in general.

The rate of increase fluctuated sharply according to the location of the parish, the growth of its population during the century, the extent of property development, changes in the distribution of wealth among inhabitants, as well as more personal factors relating to the behaviour, ability and practice of its rector. Comparative figures are available for eighty of the London livings; the remainder were omitted either from the Valor or the 1638 survey, or, in the case of some vicarages, only the vicarial income was given. Estimates are calculated from the gross rectorial income, that is, casualties and offerings as well as tithe and glebe. The rates of increase between 1535-1638 read:-

Between	28 - 29	times	: 1
"	20 - 21	"	: 1
"	14 - 15	"	: 1
"	12 - 13	"	: 1
"	10 - 11	"	: 3
"	9 - 10	"	: 4
"	8 - 9	"	: 2
"	7 - 8	"	: 7
"	6 - 7	"	: 14
"	5 - 6	"	: 11
"	4 - 5	"	: 15
"	3 - 4	"	: 14
"	2 - 3	"	: 5
"	1 - 2	"	: 1

---

1. Dale; 52,85,70.

The spectacular increase rate of St. Andrew Holborn, St. Botolph Bishopsgate, St. Katherine Coleman, and All Hallows London Wall cannot be viewed entirely without suspicion. In the first two cases, some responsibility probably lay with the 1535 assessors for undervaluing the benefice, for it is very unlikely that the rectory of St. Andrew Holborn, which apparently increased its income from £15.13.0d. to £426 within a hundred years, would have attracted three bishops-designate as incumbents during the Elizabethan period if its actual income had not at that time approximated closer to the 1638 than the 1535 estimate.[1] The sharp rate of increase in St. Katherine and All Hallows was due to their extremely low valuation in the Valor,[2] and does not necessarily reflect any enormous gravitation of wealth towards their parishes. At the other end of the scale, St. Magnus, the richest rectory in London in 1535, had only increased its income by about 50% in 1638, and was placed well down the list.[3] It is quite possible that its spectacular appearance of decline was partly due to over-assessment in 1535.

Similar miscalculations may of course have occurred in the other livings, but they are not made blatant by their more

---

1. Two of these bishops-designate were Bancroft and John King, whose considerable range of influence with ecclesiastical patrons must have allowed them virtually a free hand in their selection of benefices. The third incumbent was James Proctor who died before he could be consecrated bishop of Ferns in 1579.
2. St. Katherine Coleman; 106/8d. in 1535, £108.15.1d. in 1638. All Hallows London Wall, £8.7.2½d. in 1535, £95.5.0d. in 1638.
3. VE. I,373; Dale, 94.

moderate rates of increase. In the great majority of cases, their income had risen between three and seven times within the hundred post-Reformation years, rather less than the eight to tenfold increase alleged by Walton to have taken place in the country over the same period, but considerably more than his own claim that "...divers within the Walls of London are scarce double in Tithes since that Time 1535", while some were "... hardly so much as they were then".[1] Not one of the 1638 returns almost contemporaneous with Walton's treatise, bore out this latter assertion; apart from St. Magnus, the income of only five City livings had failed to treble itself,[2] and in two of these the explanation lay in the high valuation made in 1535. St. Dunstan in the East, for instance, assessed at £60.8.3d. in the Valor was calculated to draw an income of £164.6.4d. in 1638, hardly an amount about which complaints on the grounds of poverty were justifiable.[3]

The varying rates of increase indicate shifts in the values of City benefices relative to each other, changes which must have been evolving during the Elizabethan period. The most lucrative were no longer All Hallows the Great, St. Martin

---

1. Brewster, op.cit. 26.
2. All Hallows Honey Lane (£19.3.6½d to £47.10.0d); St.Antholin (£20.2.8d. to £53); St. Leonard Eastcheap (£25.10.0½d. to £69.6.8d.); St. Michael le Querne (£20.5.9½d. to £54.8.3d. (tithe); and St. Dunstan in East (£60.8.3d. to £164.6.4d.).
3. VE. 1,370; Dale,52.

Ludgate, St. Magnus and St. Dunstan in the East, but St. Andrew Holborn, St. Botolph Bishopsgate, All Hallows Barking, and the impropriated rectories of St. Dunstan in the West, St. Botolph Aldgate and St. Giles Cripplegate, all of which drew incomes of over £200 in 1638.[1] While a substantial proportion of the increase was post-1603, their income during the Elizabethan period must have been several times greater than that of their official valuation. In the same way, the relative poverty of other benefices was often less than suggested by the Valor assessment. The rectory of All Hallows London Wall, worth £8.7.2½d. in 1535, had apparently multiplied its income twelve times within the century, an increase that was almost identical with that of Holy Trinity Less.[2] St. Mary Staining and St. Katherine Coleman, joint-poorest in 1535 at a little over £5, brought in respectively £31.12.4d. and £108.15.1d.,[3] an eloquent comment on their differing fortunes during the course of the century; the former was still the poorest in London, the latter had attained to a position of comfortable respectability. By contrast, St. Antholin, the nursery of radical nonconformity in Elizabethan London, was in a sad decline, drawing only £43 in rectorial income, and heavily subsidised by a citizen's legacy.[4]

---

1. Dale; 197,229,8,235,224,239.
2. Ibid, 21,186.
3. Ibid. 120,81.
4. Ibid. 33.

The struggle to maintain daily lectures supported partially by parochial contributions, and the long-standing Puritan tradition of the inhabitants, had doubtless provoked a reluctance to pay tithe to an incumbent whose appointment lay outside the control of parishioners.

London benefices, we may conclude, showed a markedly uneven rate of increase in their annual income during the post-1535 century, a trend only to be expected where tithe was based on property values, which must have fluctuated sharply from parish to parish according to the economic development of each area. Analysis of the occasional parish where records of the revenues have survived, indicate that incomes by the later part of the Elizabethan reign were double, in some cases treble, those of the Valor. Certainly, by 1638, very few livings had failed to increase three-fold, and at least forty of them were between four and seven times their 1535 assessment. Part of this increase was of course post-Elizabethan, but the 1638 figures do not suggest that more than thirteen benefices in the 1580s were in receipt of less than the £30 which Harrison at that time judged to be a minimum adequate annual income for a beneficed clergyman.[1] The number, it may be noted, was slightly

---

1. Excluding impropriated livings, the 13 poorest rectories appear to have been All Hallows Honey Lane, St. Antholin, St. Benet Sherehog, St. Clement Eastcheap, St. George Botolph Lane, St. Margaret Pattens, St. Mary Bothaw, St. Mary Mounthaw, St. Mary Staining, St. Matthew Friday Street, St. Michael Paternoste St. Peter Paul's Wharf, and St. Stephen Walbrook. None of them drew an income of £60 in 1638.

less than the sixteen whose income in 1535 did not, according to the Valor, exceed the £10 regarded at that time by Cranmer as a satisfactory wage.

(iii) RECTORIAL EXPENDITURE

Some estimate of the burden of expenditure, both by royal taxation and by rectorial commitments within the parish, is needed to balance our picture of the increase in income during the period. By a statute of 1535, first fruits were required from all benefices valued at more than eight marks in the Valor Ecclesiasticus; this figure was raised in 1559 to £10 for vicarages and ten marks (£6.13.4d.) for rectories.[1] Three London benefices, St. Katherine Coleman, St. Mary Mounthaw, and St. Mary Staining thus found themselves exempted from first fruit dues.[2] Perpetual curacies, being technically not benefices, and omitted from the 1535 assessment, were likewise excepted. The rector of St. Peter ad Vincula, a Crown peculiar successfuly defied taxation demands on the grounds of privilege.[3] One vicarage, St. Bartholomew Less, fought a long battle with the Exchequer, claiming to be covered by the statute of 1559 which exempted hospitals and institutions set up for the relief of the poor, from tenths or first fruits;[4] the impropriate

---

1. Burn, ii, 279-80.
2. VE. i, 373,372,375.
3. PRO. E.179/44/301.
4. Burn, ii,281.

rectors of the living were the governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. In 1571, for instance, a delegation from the hospital was sent to petition Sir Walter Mildmay "...for the easement of the Vicker of St. Bartholomews for his first fruytes,"[1] while three years later the governors subsidised the vicar's charges in an Exchequer suit brought against him for the non-payment of a subsidy.[2] Other London incumbents, in the patronage of hospitals and collegiate foundations, followed the example of St. Bartholomew claiming that a statute of 1587, which confirme that of 1559, exempted them from subsidy liabilities.[3] Their objections were evidently subsequently overruled, for they all paid their subsidies in 1595 and 1598.[4]

Tenths, first fruits and subsidies ~~and precedents~~ were all assessed at the 1535 valuation, which, as we have seen, became increasingly anachronistic during the Elizabethan period. Heavily as they were taxed, the rate by the end of the century was in many parishes two or three times less than that due

---

1. St. Barts. Hospital, Ha.1/2, f.78v.
2. Ibid. f.104r. The governors likewise supported his refusal to pay a tenth in 1579 (f.171v.). The refusal of the inhabitants of St. Bartholomew to pay fifteenths and tenths in 1588 (claiming exemption from all taxes by virtue of the Henrician charter that founded the hospital) was less sympathetically received by the governors (Ha.1/3, f.32v.). For the vicar's refusal to pay his subsidy, cf. PRO.E.179/43/298. (1582 Subsidy Rolls).
3. PRO.E.179/44/303. A list of such parishes was compiled by the vicar-general in 1591 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope,ii,f.51r.). The London ones were Christ Church and St. Barts. Less (patrons St. Barts. Hospital), St. Alban Wood St. (Eton), St. Bride (Westminster), and St. Lawrence Jewry (Balliol).
4. PRO.E. 179/44/304; 44/312.

according to their actual income. The tenth payable by St. Dunstan in the East, for instance, should in 1592 have been nearer £12 than the £6.0.10d. charged.[1] The Crown, doubtless perturbed by the loss of potential income, made desultory efforts to revise benefice values according to their real income, and there is some evidence to suggest that the tenths of a few City livings were slightly increased.[2] The threat was certainly live enough to bring about a protest by the London clergy in their petition to Convocation in 1581. "By the malice of riche men," they asserted, some benefices had "...already passed a meluis inquirendum and racked anewe in her Majesties bookes so that the shew beinge greatt and the livinges small".[3] More substantial objections to a revision of the Valor were drawn up by Whitgift in 1585 in a paper elaborating the burdensome charges borne by the post-Reformation clergy, and which, according to Strype, succeeded in thwarting a scheme to increase tenths and first fruits and to farm out the tax revenues.[4]

In practice, the Exchequer found it difficult enough to collect tax dues even at existing rates. Responsibility for the collection of tenths, first fruits and clerical subsidies lay with the bishops of each diocese, who employed collectors for that purpose. Certificates of arrearages were sent to the Baron

---

1. GLMS. 4887, p.275.
2. e.g. St. Andrew Holborn; tenths in Valor 31/3½; in 1583 36/- (PRO. E.179 43/297).
3. Bodl. MS. Wood F30-2, p.86.
4. Strype, Whitgift, iii, 171-7.

of the Exchequer, who issued processes against defaulters. Bishops were vested by the statutes of 26 Henry VIII, and 2 and 3 Edward VI with power to deprive,[1] but the normal practice was, on receiving the Exchequer writs, to order the sequestration of the revenues of the benefice until the arrearages had been paid.[2] The church-wardens were generally made responsible for the income, and entered bonds to compound with the Exchequer by a specified date. When the arrears were cleared, order was sent to the bishop to revoke the sequestration.

With regard to first fruits, composition was customarily made, with suitable securities, over a period of years; according to Whitgift, clergymen were finding it difficult to obtain securities even at existing rates,[3] but no known complaints on this score were made by the London ministry. Occasionally, an incumbent was excused, partially or completely, but such concessions appear to be rare.[4] His burden was in some parishes eased by a benevolence granted out of the church stock by the vestry; at St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street, for instance, £20 was given to the rector in 1576 on his pledge to

---

1. Burn, ii, 282.
2. Ibid, iii, 340.
3. Strype, Whitgift, iii, 171.
4. Two London incumbents were pardoned first fruits during Mary's reign (Mullins, 53-4). Coverdale was likewise excused on his collation to St. Magnus in 1564, after the archbishop and Cecil had interceded to the Queen on his behalf. (Remains of Myles Coverdale, ed. G. Pearson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1846), xv.).

serve the cure and remain single-beneficed, and by virtue of his "...great charges for firste ffrewtts and other goings owt...".[1] Chastened perhaps by his premature departure within a year, the parishioners made only a loan to his successor, but some time later decided to cancel the debt "...in consideracon of his greate Charge as also for his paynes And travell in preaching gods word."[2] Conditional grants of this kind reflected the current trend towards increased lay control of their parson.

Despite these aids, arrearages in first fruits were common, and they accounted for the largest number of Exchequer orders for sequestration.[3] Subsidy defaulting was either rare or was seldom punished. For a large part of the reign it is clear that the collection of tenths were neglected, until in 1596, financial exigency in the Exchequer forced the bishop to take drastic action.[4] Eighty-five livings in the diocese of London

---

1. GLMS. 2596/1, f.157v.
2. Ibid, f.168r. A loan of £16 was made by the parishioners of St. Margaret Lothbury to pay off the incumbent's first fruits in 1588 (GLMS. 4352/1, f.58v.).
3. Copies of the Exchequer writs were entered in the episcopal register in the later part of the reign. Sequestration orders, giving the reasons, the names of the sequestrators and of the clergyman appointed to serve the cure, were entered in the diocesan vicar-general books.
4. cf. F.C.Dietz, English Public Finance 1558-1641 (1930), 67-78, for the acute financial difficulties resulting from the cost of military expeditions to Brittany, Normandy, and Picardy between 1591-6.

were sequestered for failing to pay tenths over periods of varying lengths, the longest being eighteen years.[1] Thirteen benefices belonged to the City,[2] the most prolonged offenders being St. Thomas Apostle and St. Christopher Stocks, which, with nine years arrearages, owed £10.16.0d. and £12.12.0d. respectively. In some cases, incumbents found themselves liable for tax-evasion by their predecessors; the vicar of St. Leonard Shoreditch, for instance, found himself paying the debts incurred between 1578-82 by a predecessor who was now 'at ease in Samaria' in Dublin and Youghal.[3]

First fruits, a more valuable source of income for the Exchequer, were less inconsistently enforced, but here again actions resulting from their non-payment were more common in the second half of the reign. Only four of the London benefices under episcopal jurisdiction - which in these matters covered the peculiars of St. Paul's - were sequestered for failure to[4]

---

1. If we include 6 prebends, the total came to 91 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, ff.62r.-66v.).
2. They were St. Ethelburgha(4 years arrearages); St. Martin Orgar (1 year); St. Thomas Apostle (9 years); St. Nicholas Cole Abbey (8 years); St. Michael Queenhithe (4 years); St. Stephen Coleman St. (5 years); St. Christopher Stocks (9 years); St. Botolph Bishopsgate (7 years); St. Antholin (3 years); St. Peter in the Tower (5 years); St. Leonard Shoreditch (4 years); St. Barts. Less (5 years); All Hallows Barking (7 years).
3. A.L.Rowse, The England of Elizabeth (1950), 419.
4. St. Giles Cripplegate, a peculiar of St. Paul's, was sequestered by the bishop in 1575. (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.19r.)

compound for first fruits by their incumbents before 1585;[1] another has been found in Archbishop Parker's register.[2] Two of these sequestrations were due to defaulting by the incumbent in a living other than that he held in London;[3] often, it appears the fruits of all his livings were withheld for his failure to compound for one of them.

After 1584, rarely a year passed without two or three sequestrations of this kind. The majority affected incumbents of livings calculated to be near the poverty-line, although the three poorest rectories by the 1535 assessment were exempt. Morgan Benyon, rector of St. Olave Silver Street (worth £7.7.11d in 1535, £65.15.10d. in 1638) found his revenues alienated in 1585 for failure to pay his first fruits due in 1583; his remedy as often happened in livings of this type, was to vacate his benefice, but by 1586 the sequestrators had managed to collect £8.9.6d. to pay the Exchequer. Two successive rectors of St. Thomas Apostle, a slightly more affluent living, were likewise sequestered; one survived the charges, doubtless because he held in plurality, the other vacated. Despite the loan of £16 made towards his first fruits, Nathaniel Baxter, rector of St.

---

1. R. of St. Mary Hill (1573); V. of St. Giles Cripplegate (1575); R. of St. Margaret Lothbury (1575); R. of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey (1577).
2. Registrum Matthei Parker, ed. W.H.Frere (Oxford 1933),ii,428
3. St. Mary Hill, which was held in plurality by Richard Beard with East Horsley in Surrey; St. Giles Cripplegate, held by Thomas Drant with the rectory of East Ealting in Sussex.

Margaret Lothbury, failed to compound, and his revenues were sequestered within three months of his institution.[1]

Occasionally, a similar misfortune befell the incumbent of a reasonably endowed living, such as the vicar of St. Mary Islington and the rector of St. Peter West Cheap in 1585,[2] but the concentration of sequestrations on livings that were assesse at less than £15 in 1535, and whose incomes in 1638 did not exceed £80, suggests that their incumbents were finding it increasingly difficult to survive in the economic conditions of the last fifteen years of the century. Greater Exchequer stringency at this time emphasised this trend, but the recurrence of the same names, St. Clement Eastcheap,[3] St. Thomas Apostle,[4] and St. Nicholas Cole Abbey,[5] shows that Exchequer policy could not alone account for the sequestration increase. The uneven rate of increase between City livings, due not as elsewhere to their being rectories or vicarages, but to the quality of property development in a particular area, was clearly causing serious repercussions among less fortunate incumbents in the later Elizabethan period.

Procurations, the amount of which was recorded in the Valor

---

1. GLMS. 4352/1, f.58v.; LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i, f.243v.
2. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i, ff.85v.,77v.
3. Sequestered for fruits 1585, 1590 (ibid. ff.59r.,345r.).
4. Sequestered for fruits 1587, 1591; for 9 years arrearages in tenths, 1596. (ibid. f.174r.; ii, f.23r.; iii, f.65r.).
5. Sequestered for fruits 1594; for 8 years arrearages in tenths 1596 (ibid. ii, f.162r.; iii, f.65r.).

but was not assessed according to that valuation,[1] were an old-established ecclesiastical charge set up in lieu of the hospitality originally undertaken by an incumbent towards his episcopal or archdiaconal visitor. Suable in the ecclesiastical court by ex officio mero procedure, only one such case has been found in the consistory court proceedings that followed the episcopal visitations of 1583 and 1601.[2] Possibly, an incumbent who failed to appear at a visitation arranged either with his proctor, curate or parochial representatives to assuage episcopal wrath by paying on his behalf. Complaints, somewhat unjustified as far as London was concerned, that visitations were often merely an excuse for the collection of procurations, were uttered by privy councillors no less than by Puritan critics,[3] but the individual charge on each parish was so small as to be negligible. The annual procuration on the ordinary's visitation payable by the rector of All Hallows Bread Street, for instance, was 7/7½d.; in 1535 the living was assessed at £37.13.9d.[4] The omission of references to this charge in the numerous petitions drawn up by the London clergy confirms the impression that even to the poorest incumbent the amount of his procuration was by this time little more than a nominal

---

1. The 13 archiepiscopal peculiars, varying considerably in value, all paid the same amount of procuration. (VE, 1,370-1).
2. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, 1,f.22r.
3. cf. Chapter XI, pp.533-4.
4. VE. 1, 370.

charge; the cost of entertaining the archdeacon and his staff would certainly have exceeded the 2/- paid by Holy Trinity the Less at the archdiaconal visitation.[1]

Rectorial expenditure within the parish was less difficult to evade. Hospitality to the poor was a virtue urged upon in ecclesiastical injunctions and visitation articles, but was seldom enforced, except with regard to non-residents, by spiritual censure. The one-fortieth of the value of the living, that non-residents worth more than £20 a year were required to dispose of in this way,[2] - a fraction assessed according to the 1535 rather than the actual valuation, - probably approximated to the minimum amount of charity judged necessary by a resident incumbent, most of it doubtless in kind. The 1560 certificates - the only ones that give this information - do not suggest a particularly hospitable resident ministry in London;[3] much must have depended on individual circumstances and scruples. In one parish at least, one-fortieth of the fruits held in lease by the parishioners from a non-resident was devoted to the poor.[4] Clergy whose total income from all their benefices amounted to over £100 a year were also required to provide a parochial exhibition

---

1. Ibid. 371.
2. e.g. Royal Injunction of 1559, No.XI, (Card. Doc. Annals, i 216).
3. In 42 parishes it was reported that no hospitality was provided, though the incumbent was resident in some of them, and several were above £20 in value. (Mullins, 221).
4. St. Mary Woolnoth (c.1554-70), GLMS. 1002/1, f.160v. The annual donation was 12/6, i.e. 1/40th of the 1535 value of £25.

of £3.6.8d. for study in a university;[1] under the 1535 assessment, only a minority of City incumbents qualified for this exaction,[2] and even if it were enforced, it could hardly have seriously affected men in such a position.

A constant liability was the maintenance of the chancel and parsonage house. Both duties were regularly checked at episcopal and archdiaconal visitations, the upkeep of the chancel, as of other fabric, being particularly the disciplinary responsibility of the archdeacon.[3] 'Detecta' by parish official of their incumbent for neglecting these duties were not uncommon among the poorer London benefices;[4] punishment ran along orthodox ecclesiastical lines of admonition, and, occasionally, sequestration.[5] The costs of repair was doubtless a reason for the frequent leases of their parsonages to laymen made by incumbents particularly if they were non-resident.[6] An

---

1. 1559 Injunctions, No.XII. (Card. Doc. Annals, 1, 217).
2. An undated document (BM. MS. Stowe 270, ff.96r.-99r.), which from internal evidence can be placed between 1573-6, gives a lis of the wealthiest dignitaries and pluralists in the country. Only two London incumbents - John Young and John Walker - held preferments which altogether exceeded £100 in value.
3. Burn, 1,96.
4. The rector of St. Olave Hart St. was detected in the archdiaconal visitation of 1563 for not repairing the chancel of his church. (GLMS. 9055 [no fol.]).
5. The rectory of St. Thomas Apostle was sequestered in 1568 because of the dilapidated state of the parsonage (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huck f.208v.).
6. e.g. The rector of St. Martin Ludgate let out his parsonage, with a reparation clause, to a layman in 1566 for 21 years at an annual rent of 26/8 (GLMS. 9531/13, f.41v.). The lease was confirmed by the bishop and the dean of St. Paul's.

injunction of 1559 stipulated that a rector should devote one-fifth of the value of his living on the repair of his chancel,[1] if in decay, a quite prohibitive proportion among the poorer incumbents whose churches were most likely to need repair. Not infrequently, friction developed between parson and parish over the obligation to repair, especially in impropriated livings, where the responsibility was less well-defined between proprietor, incumbent, and lessee of the rectorial revenues. Parishioners of the vicarage of Christ Church continually importunated the governors of St. Bartholomew their impropriate rector, to undertake repair of the church, apparently in sad decline.[2] The vicar of St. Bartholomew the Less, jealously preserving his privileges, claimed exoneration from the cost of repairing any part of the vicarage, leaving the governors to foot the bill.[3]

Some livings, particularly those in the patronage of the dean and chapter, were afflicted by long-established annuities due to the patron;[4] others owed annual pensions to the Crown.[5]

---

1. No. XIII (Card. Doc. Annals, i, 217).
2. LCRO. Rep. 17, f.153r.; 18, ff.58r, 96r, 198r, 202v.
3. St. Barts. Hospital Ha 1/2, ff.259v., 281v. According to an infrequently observed City custom, parishioners were responsible for both the body and the chancel of most churches. (Pulling, op.cit. 263).
4. e.g. All Hallows Bread St. paid £15.4.0d. p.a. to Canterbury, St. Antholin paid £1.13.4d. to St. Paul's. (Dale; 9,33.).
5. e.g. the vicar of All Hallows Barking paid a yearly pension of £13.13.8d. to the King's Receiver (Dale, 8.).

Another occasional deduction issued from the practice of granting a pension to the preceding incumbent on his resignation ostensibly intended to safeguard against the latter's indigence, the offer of a pension that might hasten the departure of an incumbent bore the suspicion of a simoniacal transaction and the practice was prohibited by a statute in 1589.[1] The deleterious effects of such a pension is evident from that claimed by Dr. Willoughby from subsequent rectors on his resignation from St. Michael Cornhill in 1562; £11 a year - raised to £15 in 1572 - was payable out of a benefice valued at £35.1.8d. in 1535, and drawing an income of £128.15.0d. a century later;[2] the fact that Willoughby lived until he was nearly a hundred years old must have exasperated later incumbents. The extent of the practice is not known, as arrangements were made privately; described as common in mid-century,[3] it may well have been in decline long before the 1589 statute.

Deductions to maintain a curate are discussed elsewhere.[4] Few resident incumbents, apart from occupants of the most populous benefices, such as St. Sepulchre and St. Giles

---

1. Statutes of the Realm, iv, 802-4 (31 El. c.6) cf. Kathleen Major, Resignation Deed of the Diocese of Lincoln, Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research, XX, (1942-3), 63. The statute Miss Major concluded, must have pressed hardly on many aged clergy.
2. Mullins, 438-9; Dale, 146.
3. Mullins, 54.
4. Chapter IX.

Cripplegate, found it necessary or profitable to employ an assistant who seldom commanded less than a £10 wage; physically disabled rectors, such as the blind Andrew Castleton, were unavoidable exceptions. Pluralism, the survival of which prevented large-scale unemployment among unbeneficed London ministers, was made conditional, inter alia, on the maintenance of a curate in the non-resident living; consequently, the poorest incumbents, most likely to benefit from holding the plurality, were least able to do so, as an annual stipend to a curate, along with the other commitments discussed above, would have virtually cancelled out the extra income derived from the second living. The financial burdens imposed by employing a curate, were thus most often borne by comfortably-endowed incumbents not gravely handicapped by the charge. Their poorer colleagues struggled along or neglected their duties, or, the ultimate remedy, sought a coadjutor, a process that involved the sequestration of their fruits and part-shares with the assistant.[1]

Alienation of income by leases by clerical rectors was generally, though not invariably, a by-product of pluralism. A two-beneficed cleric might, in return for an annual rent, dispose of the fruits of his non-resident living, thus clearing himself of the inconveniences arising from personal responsibili-

---

1. e.g. Robert Towne, R. of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.328r.).

for the revenues; the lessee was often the curate in charge, sometimes the church-wardens acting on behalf of the parish, occasionally private persons. Leases on generous terms to laymen often laid the incumbent open to the charge of simony, of an illegal contract made on his presentation disposing of part of his income, and led to legal restraints on leases of benefices. Before the Elizabethan period, there were no restrictions on leases made by rectors or vicars provided they obtained the consent of patron and ordinary;[1] this was the position until 1571 when leases of parish lands or tithes, other than for three lives or twenty-one years, were declared void.[2] Thus the non-resident rector of St. Andrew Hubbard let out his revenue to the parish for most, if not the whole of his incumbency between 1545-68.[3] The statute, reinforced by another in 1576,[4] also barred non-residents from making leases to any but the curate in charge; its purpose, declared Burn, was not directed primarily against non-residence, but against non-residents who made simoniacal bargains.[5]

The lease held by the parishioners of St. James Garlickhith from their parson in 1570 brought them an income of £28.7.1d. in tithes and other fees. The rent due to the rector amounted

---

1. Burn, ii, 363.
2. Statutes of the Realm, iv, 556. (13 El. c.20.) Impropriated rectories were excluded from the terms of the act.
3. GLMS. 1279/2, f.65r. et. seq.
4. Statutes of the Realm, iv, 622-3 (18 El. c. 11.).
5. Burn, ii, 394

to £8, and another £16 was paid to the curate. Tenths and archdiaconal procurations accounted for £1.18.7d. so the parish made a clear profit of £2.8.6d. out of the transaction.[1] A slight drop in tithe contributions, and the procurations paid at the bishop's visitation which took place in that year, reduced the profit in 1571 to less than £1.[2] At St. Andrew Hubbard, the annual rent paid in the 1560s for a lease enduring for the lifetime of the rector, was £6, the revenues of the benefice being about £5 less than those of St. James Garlickhithe.[3] In 1590, when another non-resident incumbent illegally let out his living, his rent came to £12, a rise that corresponded fairly closely with the increased income of the benefice since the early 1560s.[4]

Possibly, the terms of these leases were more favourable to the incumbent than those disposed of to private persons. They gave a pluralist rector an annual untaxed increment that augmented the revenues obtained from his other living, but their consequences on the lay attitude towards paying tithe as a spiritual obligation could only be deleterious. Leases that did not expire on the death of the lessor, could also be a grave liability to succeeding incumbents, who might be resident and single-beneficed. The statute of 1571 appears, however, to have put an end to the worst effects of the practice, only one

---

1. GLMS. 4810/1, f.36v.
2. Ibid. f.39v.
3. GLMS. 1279/2, f.83r. et seq.
4. Ibid, f.136r.

lease by a non-resident transacted later than this date having been discovered.[1]

Far more common was the custom of farming out the tithes, - in some cases, the whole revenue -, for an annual composition; the incumbent thus avoided the inconvenience of collecting tithe himself, and the farmer made his profit from the surplus he gathered. Generally, the latter was also made responsible for the enforcement of tithe payment, and bore the expenses of litigation. The practice was widespread among all but the poorest incumbents, and probably the amount of income lost by the rector was more than compensated by the advantages derived from avoiding the unpleasant task of touring the parish in search of his dues. Twelve out of twenty-three City incumbents who were cited before the consistory court in 1578 were said to employ farmers. The proportion, high as it was, was far smaller than that practised in the rural parts of the diocese, for eighty-four out of 110 parishes similarly cited, possessed farmers to collect the revenues.[2] The difference probably lay in the greater proportion of impropriated livings, whose revenues were almost invariably farmed out, in the rural areas than in London itself. As long as incumbents were able to adjust the rate of composition periodically to the increase in actual income, farming was not seriously detrimental to a rector's

---

1. James Taylor, R. of St. Andrew Hubbard, in the years 1558-93 (GLMS. 1279/2, ff.136r.-149v.).
2. LCCRO. Lib. Act 1577-9, ff.234r.-v.

pocket. The benefices most likely to be affected by any loss that was incurred by composition were those least likely to have their revenues farmed out.

(iv) THE TITHE CONTROVERSY

The basic grievance of the London clergy throughout the post-1535 century was their inability to tap the increasing wealth of the capital at the rate laid down in the 1535 tithe decree.[1] By contrast with the loss of income following the alleged failure to enforce tithe payment at 2/9 in the £ on rental values, the drain on the ministerial pocket from taxation rectorial obligations and leasing of revenues was subsidiary. "The sheape [are] well clad and the pastors go naked", London ministers declared in 1581,[2] "and yett a resonable order taken for tithes by statute and no order obserued in paynge ther tithes becawse they are for their riches stoute and will not paie and becawse they maie have lawe at hande..." In other words, the clergy attributed their (alleged) poverty to tithe evasions on the part of citizens and inadequate legal remedies to enforce payment.

Evasion was engineered by means of ingenious techniques of withholding knowledge of the true rental values from the tithe-owner, be he clergyman or impropriator. Ministers were not slow

---

1. cf. Hill, 280-3.
2. Bodl. MS. Wood F30-2, p.86.

in giving details of the "...collusions...by the which the poor Clergie of London are deceaued".[1] By one form of connivance, a tenant granted his landlord the use of a sum of money - perhaps £300 - and at the same time enjoyed a 'faire house' for a peppercorn rent which alone was subject to tithe. Double leases were sometimes arranged, the nominal one being that shown to the parson. Variants included entry fines, the reservation of a covenanted agreement or an obligation to compound sums over a number of years, concealed behind a small rent.[2] Again, the major part of the rent might ostensibly be paid for household fittings or the use of a well, neither covered by the terms of the 1546 decree. Such was the tenor of clerical grievances in 1581 and in 1638 when the tithe controversy reached its climax; "...and they have one hundred such deuises to cossen us withall".[3]

By means of these evasions and of the decline in personal tithes, the clergy complained, citizens worth more than £10,000 paid less tithe than a rural freeholder drawing but £4 a year in income.[4] City aldermen, according to Heylyn, paid no more than

---

1. Ibid. p.86.
2. cf. Lawnd v. Newton 1592. The defendant was found to be paying an annual rent of £8.7s. for his tenement, and £51.13s. a year "...in respect of a fine or income for the same tenement" (LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1591-4 [no fol.] (February 1592)).
3. Bodl. MS. Wood, F30-2, p.86; Dale, vii; Brewster, op.cit. 173. et seq.
4. Bodl. MS. Wood, F30-2, p.86.

20/- a year in tithe, and they "...do not use to dwell in Sheds and Cottages."[1] Indeed, the bulk of tithe in 1638 was said to be paid by the 'meaner sort'. In consequence, the 'meanest Tradesmen' earned more than a London clergyman, although "... we are equal to the best Commoners in this City, in all Charges ..."[2]

Clerical protests were not confined to petitions. Negotiated settlements increasing tithe-assessments were sometimes found possible between parson and parish around the vestry table. At St. Dunstan in the East, six arbitrators were set up by the vestry in 1575, on a complaint by the rector, to deal with tithe-defaulters, and re-assess their contributions; the rector meanwhile had £20 to cover his past losses.[3] Eighteen years later, further complaints of "...dyvers howses untaxed or not ceased [assessed] to pay tythes, although they paie great rents for the same", led to the appointment of eleven arbitrators to tax all houses "...as well those that be undertaxed, as also such as are not Taxed"[4]. Most satisfactory was the position in an impropriated living held by parochial proprietorship, where the vestry had been transformed from a tithe-paying to a tithe-owning body. Defaulting was least likely where those who paid tithe had a voice in the disposal

---

1. P. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (1668), 281-5.
2. Brewster, op.cit. 263.
3. GLMS. 4887, p.217.
4. Ibid. p.278.

of their contributions. The parishioners of St. Helen Bishopsgate for instance, purchased a lease of the rectorial impropriation in 1589; they immediately increased the assessment of many inhabitants and within a year had managed to augment the tithe income by nearly £8.[1]

Failing a bi-lateral agreement between parson and parish, the persistent tithe-owner had no alternative than to sue defaulters. Ambiguities in the 1546 decree resulted in a century of confusion over the rival claims of spiritual and secular courts to determine tithe disputes. The decree, which gave the right to the mayoral court, and ultimately to the Lord Chancellor, omitted any reference to the bishpp of London who had previously determined these cases. The mayoral jurisdiction was challenged as early as 1554 in an address from the lower to the upper house of Convocation, the clergy appreciating that the mayor with his responsibilities towards citizens, was hardly a disinterested party.[2] On the other hand, it should be noted that by virtue of the impropriations held by the City, the Mayor was also to some extent among the tithe-owning interest.[3] In fact, the conflict that lay latent between the secular and spiritual courts on this matter, did not break out during the Elizabethan period. No complaints against the

---

1. GLMS. 6836, f.280v.
2. Card. Synod, 1, 437.
3. The impropriations of Christ Church and St. Bartholomew Less belonged to the City.

Lord Mayor were included in the grievances drawn up by the London clergy in 1581. Prohibitions against the settlement of tithe disputes in the consistory court were extremely rare befor 1603; of the four traced, two were later annulled by consultations.[1] Only in one recorded case in the ecclesiastical court did the defendant claim a 'stay' on the ground that the case was to proceed before the Mayor,[2] while there is one instance of the Mayor asserting the authority given him by the 1546 decree and demanding the suspension of proceedings in the consistory court.[3]

In short, the conflict which arose to its climax in 1638, was a projection of the efforts of early-Stuart common lawyers to usurp the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, and was set in motion by the ruling of the Common Pleas in 1607 that London ministers might not sue for tithes in ecclesiastical courts.[4] Clerical accusations of mayoral partiality, complaints of procedure in the Mayor's court on the grounds that parties could not be put on oath nor leases exhibited, so vehement later,[5] were not audible during the Elizabethan period.

Enquiries concerning tithe defaulters formed a regular

---

1. Consultations granted in Scarlet v. Bedford 1582 (LCCRO. Lib Act. 1581-4, f.61r.). cf. Lib. Act. 1599-1605, ff.30v., 303v. for two other prohibitions. Another is quoted by Croke, Reports i, 276.
2. Clark v. Pystor 1576 (Lib. Act. 1575-7 [no fol.]).
3. LCRO. Letter Bk. V, f.274r.
4. Skydmore and Eire v. Bell (Burn, iii, 560).
5. Brewster, op.cit. 175.

feature of visitation articles, but church-wardens and sidesmen were naturally reluctant to present fellow-parishioners on such delicate matters. Visitors, moreover, appear to have abandoned the pre-Reformation custom of personally investigating defaulters and subjecting them to ecclesiastical censure.[1] The onus of commencing legal proceedings was laid on the tithe-owner himself, thus relieving the diocesan administration of the danger of bearing the costs of an unsuccessful suit. Tithe disputes in the ecclesiastical courts came under what was termed an Instance cause, the equivalent to a civil case in the secular courts. Proceedings were plenary in form and subject to the vexations and delays inherent in a type of procedure that allowed proctors so much scope in obstructing an early judicial decision.[2] Where the machinery was so elaborate, the expenses of a case, borne by the defendant if he lost the case, and by the plaintiff if the suit were unsuccessful or abandoned before sentence was pronounced, could not have been negligible.

Tithe-owners who were prepared to face the vicissitudes of Instance cause procedure, including the considerable initial difficulty of securing the attendance of the defendant in court, sometimes found their progress smoothed. A common practice

---

1. Ibid. 36; Dale, vi. But cf. B.L.Woodcock, Medieval Ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese of Canterbury (1952), 86.
2. For an exhaustive treatment of consistory court procedure, see F.S.Hockaday, The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester, Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc. XLVI (1924), 197-287.

among tithe defendants was, after hearing the plaintiff's libels read, to offer a composition sum "...ad evitandum ulteriorem litem."[1] The offer generally consisted of part payment of tithes due, and of the court expenses to that stage of the case. If the plaintiff were not satisfied, the case continued. Sometimes, the parties were able to come to agreement out of court, and the case was then abandoned; four suits brought by the rector of St. Bartholomew the Great in 1599-1600 were abruptly ended "in pacem et concordiam".[3] A much larger number of cases were abandoned for different reasons because of the inability of the tithe-owner to secure the attendance of prosecution witnesses or even the defendant, despite the issue of admonitions, viis et modis writs, and others of graver spiritual significance. Only rarely, however, could a plaintiff afford the luxury of a significavit, that is, an appeal to Chancery for a writ de excommunicando capiendo, authorising the arrest of the offender.[4]

---

1. Stile v. Myraditt (LCCRO.Lib.Act.1575-7 [no fol.], Jan.28,1576
   Rosedale v. Turrell (" " " 1579-81, f.346v.).
   Vicars v. Berry (" " " 1599-1605, f.289v.).
2. e.g. in Stile v. Myraditt, the plaintiff accepted an offer of 2/- tithe arrears, and 9/10d. costs.
3. Lib. Act. 1599-1605, f.3v. et seq.
4. Only 6 significavits have been found in the Court Bks. of the period. cf. Woodcock, op.cit. 97: "It may be found that the expenses incurred in Chancery, and the lack of efficiency or co-operation of the local authorities partially accounted for the extremely infrequent use of the sanction of signification by the Canterbury Courts."

Only a minority of tithe cases were therefore likely to reach the final stages, and then not within less than a period of several months. Between 1577-79, 163 out of over 400 suits of all types commenced in the Consistory went no further than the primary citation.[1] Tithe suits that did reach a conclusion often lasted over a period of several months, as the consistory court seldom sat more than two or three days in a fortnight. The case Hollingbrigg v. Hart, the farmer of the tithes of St. Lawrence Jewry against a parishioner, was entered on twenty-three court days before sentence was reached.[2] Exceptionally prolonged was the tithe suit brought by the rector of St. Bartholomew Great against a parishioner called Lambeth which continued for three years, and was eventually quashed by a prohibition.[3]

The sentence books of the consistory court for this period have not survived, but there is sufficient evidence to show that the partiality of tithe-owners to sue in this court cannot be completely explained by judicial sympathy for their cause. Plaintiffs did not always win their cases; in Nicholls v. Tudball, 1571-2, for instance, the sentence went against the rector after the case had lasted almost a year.[4] David Dee, rector of St. Bartholomew Great had thirty-one suits between

---

1. Lib. Act. 1577-9, passim.
2. Lib. Act. 1577-9, f.241v et seq.
3. Ibid. 1599-1605, ff.3v.-203v. passim.
4. Ibid. 1569-72, ff.202v.-291v. passim.

1599-1601 in a comprehensive effort to eradicate the privileges of his parishioners who paid no tithe.[1] Only two cases were decided in his favour; nine were dismissed with costs borne by the plaintiff, while fourteen others were abandoned before sentence was reached. The misfortunes of John Pitt, rector of All Hallows London Wall, were on a smaller scale, but in 1576 he lost three cases through failure to prove his libels within the period allowed by Instance cause procedure, and his costs amounted to 40/-.[2]

The risks incurred by a clerical plaintiff of limited means was evidently far from negligible, as is clear from the experience of Dee and Pitt; the latter, in fact, failed to appear at court to pay his expenses. Penalty was temporarily reserved because of his poverty, but further contempt led to his excommunication, and only then did he pay off his debts.[3] It should be noted, however, that none of these clerical plaintiffs, poor as some may have been, qualified to plead "in forma pauperis", a course open to very poor suitors.

Despite the procedural vicissitudes and the risk of failing to prove their case, tithe-owners remained partial to the consistory court throughout the Elizabethan period. Only

---

1. Ibid. 1599-1605, ff.3v.-203v. passim.
2. Ibid. 1575-77 [no fol.] Dec. 4th, 1576. For the proving of libels see Hockday, loc. cit. 257-8.
3. Lib. Act. 1575-7 [no fol.] Feb.23rd., April 24th, April 29th

one case has been traced in Chancery,[1] and another in the Court of Requests.[2] The surviving records of the City government reveal only five tithe disputes before 1603 that were decided before the Lord Mayor;[3] only in one of these did the Mayor assert the authority given him by the 1546 decree, and demand suspensio of proceedings in the spiritual court.[4] Occasionally, tithe-owners sued in the archiepiscopal court of Arches or Audience, although neither was officially a court of first instance.[5] The rarity of cases found in other than the consistory court, as well as the rarity of appeals from the diocesan to a superior court,[6] strongly suggest that tithe-owners retained full confidence in the justice meted out in the consistory court. In fact, the Lord Mayor and his associates not infrequently themselves sued tithe-defaulters in that court,[7] an ironical situation in the light of the 1546 decree and the early Stuart boycott of the ecclesiastical in favour of the mayoral court.

---

1. Edward Grome (Crome) v.J.Holgrave [no date].(PRO.C.3/78/24). I am indebted to Mr. W.J.Jones, a fellow-student, for providing this information.
2. PRO. C.Req. 36,89,1-5. (Tripp v. Glover 1598).
3. LCRO. Letter Bk. V,f.272v.; Y,f.46r.; Rep.14,f.314v.; 19, f.22v.; 22,f.221v.
4. Letter Bk. V,f.274r.
5. The parish clerk of St. Botolph Aldgate recorded numerous citations against alleged tithe-defaulters in the parish in his Memo. Bks. (GLMS.9234/1-6). Two came from the Arches, and one from the Court of Audiences; the remainder were all from the consistory court.
6. Only 2 inhibitions from the Arches to the Consistory have been traced (Lib. Act 1581-4 [no fol.], Oct.16th/83; ibid. 1589-93, f.322r.).
7. 6 suits were brought against parishioners of Christ Church, 1577-9 (Lib. Act. 1577-9, index).

The type of litigant in a tithe-dispute on the whole gives less indication of the poverty of tithe-owners than of their anxiety to exact the utmost dues. In the first place, the most persistent suitors were private impropriators or their lessees, or the lay farmers of rectorial tithes. An exception must be made of those impropriations which were in parochial proprietorship, where mutual harmony between parson and parish was most possible.[1] The farmer of the Crown impropriation of St. Botolph Aldgate was a habitual suitor post-1580, as were the Lord Mayor and Communalty, before they let out the tithes of Christ Church in 1581. Parishioners of St. Lawrence Jewry were continually being sued by the laymen who farmed the rectorial tithe from Balliol College, and this may have influenced the parochial decision in 1587 to purchase a lease of the impropriation;[2] significantly, tithe suits from this parish subsequently ceased abruptly. The litigiousness of lay rectors and farmers may have found a cause in the reluctance among citizens to pay what was regarded as a spiritual due, to a layman; more likely, lay tithe-owners were less hesitant to sue

---

1. e.g. St. Mary Aldermanbury, St. Lawrence Pountney, Holy Trinity Minories (no tithe suits recorded).
2. Differences were exacerbated by a quarrel between J. Hollingbrigg and J. Shrawley, both of whom claimed the right to farm the tithes on behalf of the lessor (Lib. Act. 1581-4 [no fol.], May 4th./82). During the quarrel, it was agreed that a sequestration to collect tithe be issued to the churchwardens pro interesse the successful claimant. (GLMS. 2590/1, p.59).

than their clerical counterparts because they need not take into account the damaging effects on the relationship between parson and parish that inevitably resulted from continual litigation.

Among clerical plaintiffs, litigiousness cannot always be related to the values of livings. The poorest incumbents rarely risked incurring the costs of an unsuccessful case; the fate of John Pitt,[1] a less discreet or perhaps more desperate, member of this group, was a sad example to others. Thus, parishioners of St. Mary Staining, St. Mary Mounthaw, St. Thomas Apostle, St. Olave Silver Street, and their like, were rarely cited, doubtless not because they paid more conscientiously than their fellow-citizens, but because their incumbent could not afford to employ a proctor and risk litigation. The more scrupulous type of parson, the man who laid great stress on his preaching duties, his personal residence on the living, and harmonious parochial relationship, seldom felt justified in risking deterioration in relations by suing tithe-defaulters. Tithe-dues were probably more consistently paid by parishioners who enjoyed the services of such an incumbent, of a man like Andrew Castleton, rector of St. Martin Iremonger, Richard Cazer of All Hallows Honey Lane, or John Johnson of St. Andrew Undershaft.

---

1. Supra, p. 352.

The most common clerical suitor was therefore quite likely to be the incumbent of a comfortably-endowed benefice; his litigiousness was decided less by his pocket than by his vocational standards. Ralph Whytlin, pluralist rector of St. Andrew Holborn, which was by 1538 the wealthiest benefice in London, sued a number of parishioners in 1567 and again in 1576 when suits against twenty-four parishioners were commenced.[1] John Denton's nickname, 'The Knave of Clubs', was perhaps due to his litigiousness.[2] John Twydale, pluralist and non-resident, did not hesitate to sue those whose annual dues were in arrears, although his benefice, St. Martin Ludgate, was among the five most highly assessed in 1535.[3] The most litigious parish of all seems to have been St. Sepulchre; on one occasion, the incumbent sued sixty-four parishioners almost simultaneously.[4] The revenues were subsequently farmed out to private laymen who were just as assiduous in their efforts to enforce tithe payment.[5] Citizens evidently related their contributions to the merits of the parson. Tithe had after all lost most of its sacrosanct significance with the large-scale secularisation of ecclesiastical revenues at the dissolution of the monasteries.

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1575-7 passim.
2. GLMS. 9234/2, f.82v.; Lib. Act. 1581-5, index sub Denton.
3. Lib. Act. 1575-7, 1577-9, index.
4. Lib. Act. 1577-9, ff.7v.-120v. passim.
5. e.g. between 1590-3, Piper and Hacott, the farmers, cited about 60 parishioners (Lib. Act. 1589-93 passim.).

The Protestant citizen of Elizabethan London, less tolerant of clerical standards than his predecessors, found in the disposing or withholding of his tithe, a positive means of expressing his approval or disapproval of his parson's behaviour, and perhaps, of influencing his subsequent activity. Puritan teaching doubtless encouraged this attitude. Tithe, said that ardent radical, Eusebius Paget, should be paid to "...they that preach the gospel", but "...masse men, the idle shepheards, the dumb dogs, the blind and sleepie watchmen..." deserved no reward.[1]

This state of mind, a blend of anti-clericalism and Puritanism with the tendency among citizens to exert greater control over the ministry that was characteristic of the period, may, along with the natural dislike of a tax, explain the tithe evasion that existed. Not only might it account for the type of tithe-owner that most often had recourse to litigation, but it provides a clue to the fluctuations in the number of tithe-suits that occurred during the period. Exact figures are not possible, but it is clear that the most litigious period in the years covered by the surviving consistory court act books was that between 1579-81. The petition of the London clergy to Convocation, which dealt principally with tithe-defaulters, was delivered early in 1581.[2] The rectors or farmers of twenty-two of the ninety-three parishes subject to episcopal jurisdiction

---

1. E. Paget, A Godly and Fruiteful Sermon (c.1580), Sig. B4, ff.3v.-4r.

2 Bodl MS Wood F 30-2. It was "read and admitted" Feb 10th

sued in the consistory court for tithes during these two years.[1] These developments coincided with a rapid expansion in the number of parish lectureships; their occupation, in several instances, by leading nonconformist preachers; and the embarking of Aylmer's campaign against Puritan lecturers.[2] The interaction of these factors might well account for the bitterness of relations between parson and parish that was symptomised by an unprecedented amount of litigation.[3]

Factors other than those of poverty, we may conclude, were often responsible for the amount of tithe litigation in the consistory court during this period. Most significant was the reflection behind the tithe dispute of graver problems of lay/clerical relationship, issues of control that within the existing framework of the church could only be reconciled by specific, piecemeal remedies. In London, one of these was paradoxically found in the employment of impropriations, ostensibly one of

---

1. ~~Bodl. MS. Wood F30-2. It was "read and admitted" Fuby. 10th.~~
1. Lib. Act. 1579-81, passim.
2. cf. Chapter VIII, pp. 400-1.
3. Parishes involved in tithe litigation in the Consistory in the years covered by the surviving Act Books:

1565	- 9	5
1569	- 72	13
1575	- 7	16
1577	- 9	11
1579	- 81	22
1581	- 4	12
1589	- 93	14
1599	- 1605	26 [up to 1603]

the most acute abuses within the church.

(v) IMPROPRIATIONS

According to Hooker, the church lost £126,000 a year through impropriations; a 1588 estimate put it at £100,000.[1] Over a third of the total number of livings in the country were calculated to be impropriated in 1603; in some dioceses they amounted to 50% or more.[2] The diocese of London was less heavily affected, Heylyn estimating that there were 189 impropriations in 623 parishes.[3] The proportion among the parishes under study was even smaller, twenty-three - possibly twenty-four - out of the 111 being either vicarages or perpetual curacies whose rectorial income was alienated from the cure of souls. The difference between the London ratio and the national average it may be borne in mind, constituted a not unimportant reason for the superior standards of the City ministry.

Two of the City impropriations were post-Reformation creations, the parishes of Christ Church and St. Bartholomew Les both being created on the foundation of St. Bartholomew's Hospita in 1546. St. Anne Blackfriars and Holy Trinity Minories were curacies set up on ex-monastic sites. The remainder were old-established parishes, formerly attached to religious houses which in return for receiving the rectorial income, had maintained a minister to serve the cure. On the dissolution of

---

1. cf. Hill, 145.
2. Ibid. 145.
3. Cyprianus Anglicus, 185.

the monasteries, most of the impropriations had fallen to the Crown, but several had been re-granted by the Elizabethan period. The rectories of St. Mary Aldermanbury, St. Lawrence Pountney, and St. James Clerkenwell were all let out to trustees acting on behalf of the parishioners during the reign; others were held on lease by private layment.[1] In the 1590s financial exigency drove the Queen to make outright sales of at least three royal impropriations in London,[2] a policy followed by her Stuart successors.[3]

Sixteen years' purchase was said to be the current price for an impropriate rectory in the early seventeenth century.[4] By this standard, the Crown was at times a hard bargainer. Thirty years' purchase was the price paid by the parishioners of St. Stephen Coleman Street in 1590: the £300 needed was obtained by loans which were paid off by the sale of a substantial amount of parish property.[5] Somewhat more reasonable was the £510.18.7d. paid by the Stanhope brothers for the rectory of St. Helen Bishopsgate in 1599 when the tithes were

---

1. e.g. St. Botolph Aldgate, where a reversionary lease was sold by the Queen to one Patenham in 1588 (GLMS. 9234/1, f.85v. (2nd.fol.section)). A lessee of St. Sepulchre paid an annual rent of £32.5.1d., and a fine of £64.10.2d. (Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1560-3, 27).
2. St. Stephen Coleman St. (1590), St. Lawrence Pountney (1591), St. Helen Bishopsgate (1599).
3. All Hallows Staining, All Hallows Less, and St. Mary Aldermanbury were alienated by James I or his son.
4. By Thomas Adams; quoted by Hill, 138.
5. GLMS. 4457/2, f.22r

worth about £30 a year.[1] At St. Mary Aldermanbury, the tithes came to £25 in 1570; fifty years later, the rectory and advowson were sold by the Crown for £440, about sixteen years' purchase price at the 1570 valuation, and probably much less at the current value.[2] The rectory and appurtenances of All Hallows Less were sold by James I for £450.1.8d., a sum that was approximately seven times the gross income in 1638, and could be considered extremely cheap.[3]

Incumbents saw only a fraction of the rectorial income, although in this respect their position was probably no worse than that of the pre-Reformation ancestors under monastic appropriation. Vicarial salaries may be discussed first. St. Mary Islington fell outside the jurisdiction of the City tithe decree, and the incumbent, as in rural areas, was dependent on the small tithes of the benefice for most of his income. The litigiousness of the rectorial lessee[4] suggests that parishioners were no more ready than in certain City parishes to contribute what was considered their due obligation. No details are available to check Whitgift's claim that vicarages "...are

---

1. The Annals of St. Helens' Bishopsgate, ed.J.E.Cox (1876), 50-1; GLMS. 6836, f.62v.
2. GLMS. 3556/1, p.4; P.C.Carter, The History of St. Mary the Virgin Aldermanbury (1913), 8.
3. H.B.Wilson, A History of the Parish of St. Lawrence Pountney (1831), 71, note k.: Dale, 14.
4. cf. Lib. Act. 1577-9, index sub Birkhed, for a number of citations against parishioners.

everywhere by more than a third parte decayed since the taxation."[1]

Of the City vicarages, St. Dunstan West and St. Giles Cripplegate appear to have been endowed, while the vicar of St. Sepulchre was allowed a third of the rectorial income.[2] Their rate of increase during the century therefore approximated to that of rectories, for unlike the position elsewhere, they were based on the same source. In practice, the loss of rectorial income was compensated at St. Giles and St. Dunstan by periodic leases of the impropriation to the vicar.[3] This long-established custom had been defended in the Convocation of 1529 as a means of relieving vicarial poverty,[4] but such leases had been limited by Henrician statutes of mortmain, restricting the restoration of impropriations to their original purpose, to a period no longer than twenty consecutive years.[5] In the early seventeenth century, notwithstanding, the vicar of St. Dunstan sub-let his lease of the impropriation to the parishioners for twenty-one years at £200 rent a year, an income that compared favourably with that of most rectories.[6]

Less fortunate was the vicar maintained on a stipendiary

---

1. Strype, Whitgift, iii, 174.
2. cf. Cal. Patent Rolls 1560-3, 27, for a lease of the rectory which provided for 1/3rd. of the profits to the vicar.
3. The vicar was the lessee in both parishes in 1638.
4. R.A.R.Hartridge, Vicarages in the Middle Ages (Cambridge 1930), 201.
5. Hill, 273-4.
6. Times Literary Supplement, Sept.16th,1955, p.548.

basis, and who financially had no better status than a perpetual curate. A fixed stipendiary payment could not respond to increases in the income of the impropriation, and with the two or three-fold increase in rectorial revenues during the Elizabethan period, these vicarial salaries were becoming ludicrously anachronistic. The vicar of St. Bartholomew Less received the same annual stipend of £13.6.8d. in 1603 as he had done in 1546.[1] The salary of £26.13.4d. payable to the vicar of Christ Church by the Henrician orders of 1546 remained the same until 1602 although rectorial income had increased from £66.18.7d. to at least £100.[2] Ultimately, the vicar sued the rectors in Chancery, which decreed an increase of £10 in his stipend.[3] The £11 a year received by the vicar of St. Stephen Coleman Street in 1547 was the wage laid down by an agreement made in 1456.[4] The failure of the Crown, the impropriators since the dissolution of the monasteries, to augment the vicar's salary, doubtless explains the prolonged vacancy in the living from 1562-1594. Not until the impropriation had been purchased by the parishioners in 1590 and the stipend raised by nearly 300% to £30 was the vacancy filled.[5] A similar improvement occurred at St. Lawrence Jewry following the purchase of the

---

1. St. Barts. Hospital, Hb/1/1; Hb/1/2, [no fol.].
2. Ibid. (1602).
3. Ibid (1603).
4. Newcourt, i, 535.
5. GLMS. 4457/2, f.32v. For corrections to Hennessy's list of incumbents, see Appendix A.

lease of the impropriation by the parishioners in 1587; within a few years the vicar's stipend was doubled in return for preaching committments which he undertook.[1] In contrast, no change was made at St. Helen Bishopsgate when the parishioners brought a lease of the rectory; no doubt they considered the existing £20 wage which the Crown had allowed, an adequate wage for serving the cure.[2] As elsewhere, augmentation was possible by way of reading lectures.[3]

The perpetual curacies were subject to the same financial vicissitudes as the unendowed vicarages, but as most of them were owned by that least generous class of impropriators, the Crown, the stipends of their incumbent tended to be even more paltry. The independent allowance of the curates, both at All Hallows Less and All Hallows Staining, was £8 in 1638.[4] £10 was reserved for the incumbent of St. Lawrence Pountney; when a lease was secured by the parishioners, the stipend was increased to £24 a year conditional on the curate reading lectures.[5] At St. Mary Aldermanbury, where the parishioners were leaseholders of the Crown impropriation, £16 was allowed to the perpetual curate from early in the reign.[6] Most miserable of all was the stipend of the curate in the Minories

---

1. GLMS. 2590/1, p.106.
2. GLMS. 6836, f.63r.
3. cf. Chapter VIII, pp.434-7
4. Dale; 14,18.
5. GLMS. 3907/1 [no.fol.] (1594 et seq.).
6. GLMS. 3570/1, f.5r.

which varied from £5 in 1567. £4.10.0d. in 1582 to £6.13.4d. in 1597.[1] In this case, the responsibility lay with the parishioners who owned or leased the tithes, and whose parsimony can be attributed to their preoccupation with maintaining outside preachers and lecturers who were the principal beneficiaries of the rectorial income.[2] In contrast, the curate at St. James Clerkenwell, where the revenues of the benefice were likewise leased by the Crown to the parishioners, enjoyed a salary of £20 a year on condition that he provided for the quarterly sermons.[3]

While perpetual curacies, unlike vicarages, were exempt from tenths and first fruits, and subsidies and other extraordinary benevolences appear to have been borne by the rector,[4] these hardly compensated for the loss of offerings and certain of the casual fees which normally went to the impropriator.[5] Stipends fluctuated sharply from parish to parish and there is enough evidence to show that royal and private impropriators tended to be less generous to the minister than parochial proprietors. The latter, after all, had a direct interest in the welfare of the cure, and were often not reluctant

---

1. Tomlinson, op.cit. 196-8.
2. cf. Chapter XI, pp. 518-22
3. J.P.Malcolm, Londinium Redivivum, iii (1803), 203-4.
4. This was certainly the case in the parochial proprietorships. (e.g. GLMS. 3556/1, pp.18,23,51). The parishioners of St. Mary Aldermanbury went so far as to pay for their minister's preaching licence (ibid. p.167).
5. These were occasionally granted on an ad hoc basis to the curate. (ibid. p.5.). But cf. GLMS. 3570/1, f.13r.

to divert part of the impropriated revenue to augment the curate's wage in order to attract better qualified men. The deleterious effect on the church of impropriation was less apparent when parishioners succeeded in obtaining either a purchase or a lease of the rectorial income, and were prepared to use part of the profits to improve the status of the cure. The consequences were financially beneficial to the incumbent, but they accelerated the tendency towards greater lay control over ministerial activities. The incumbent's augmentation came to him not by right but as a benevolence; it could be withdrawn and at the same time it could be granted on certain conditions, which might end in the cleric being forced to play the parishioners' tune. The purchase of impropriation by the parish could lead to the diversion of that impropriation for particular sectarian ends. The Puritan feoffees of the 1620s who purchased impropriations to maintain nonconformist preachers, were doing no more than logically extending the practices of their late-Elizabethan ancestors.[1]

---

1. For the most detailed study of the Feoffees for Impropriations, cf. Isabel Calder, Activities of the Puritan Faction of the Church of England, 1625-33 (1957).

CHAPTER EIGHT

PARISH LECTURERS AND LECTURESHIPS.[1]

James I, in his Directions Concerning Preachers, 1622, described lecturers as "a new body severed from the ancient clergy of England, as being neither parsons, vicars or curates."[2] To trace the emergence of this ministerial phenomenon, and, indeed, to test the validity of the royal definition in an earlier reign, it is necessary to explore deeply into the ecclesiastical undergrowth of Elizabethan London,[3] the nursery of the parish lecturer.[4] Our conclusions may reveal a type of preacher unfamiliar to James I, a body so variously formed that

---

1. Briefly, in contemporary usage, a lecture meant a sermon delivered on a Sunday (a.m. or p.m.) or weekday by a preacher who might be the incumbent, his curate or an outsider. It was a sermon supplementary to those required by law, from which it could usually be distinguished by its expository nature - each lecture was usually part of a series on a closely correlated group of texts -, and by the (generally) voluntary form of parochial contribution that financed it. For a more intimate type of 'lector', see The Diary of Lady Ann Hoby 1599-1605, ed. Dorothy M.Meads (1930), 243, n.177.
2. Documents Illustrative of English Church History, ed. H.Gee and W.J.Hardy (1896), 518.
3. The main sources are parochial records which give valuable information on terms of appointment, stipends, methods of maintenance etc.; Libri Visitationum (details of 'outsiders' only); wills, and the fragmentary Libri Correctionum that survive.
4. cf. P.Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (1668), 282. London "... was generally looked on as the Compass by which the lesser Towns and Corporations were to steer their Course, the practice of it being pleaded upon all occasions, for Vestries, Lectures, and some other innovations in the State of the Church".

its shape as an independent being was barely distinguishable. The complex nature of the man employed as lecturer by Elizabethan citizens, may best be brought to light by discussing first the radical associations attached to the origins of lectureships, and their growth post-1572, followed by an analysis of the personnel and the conditions of their employment.

(i) ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

There is much uncertainty about the origins of parochial lectureships in London or elsewhere.[1] The Puritan 'lecture-courses' of the early seventeenth century were, according to G.R.Owst, foreshadowed by fifteenth-century homily series such as that of Jacob's Well,[2] but he could find no evidence of a lineal relationship. Nor did E.G.Ashby's study of pre-Reformation parochial activities in the City bring to light any possible medieval ante-cedent of the Protestant lecture.[3] There is some evidence of divinity lectures established in collegiate foundations in London before the Henrician changes, and these may possibly have served as models. The St. Paul's lecture can be traced back to Bishop Richard de Gravesend, who founded it shortly before 1280.[4] In the second year of Edward II's reign

---

1. cf. Selden's analogy with the medieval friars. (OED. sub. lecturer.).
2. G.R.Owst, Preaching in Medieval England (1926), 94, note 1.
3. E.G.Ashby, Some Aspects of Parish Life in the City of London 1429-1529. (London M.A. thesis 1950).
4. W.S Simpson, Chapters in the History of Old S Paul's (1881), 48.

the position was endowed, and henceforward appeared to enjoy a continuous existence. In 1508, James Finch, Master of the Fraternity of Sheremen, bequeathed money to set up a divinity lecture at Whittington College, and the endowment survived the conversion of that foundation into a parish church.[1]

The earliest of the endowed parish lectureships was a direct result of the Henrician reformation. It was set up at St. Antholin, a church whose comparative smallness was to bear no relation to the turbulence of its history in the following hundred years. The "Lecturers' Estates" were purchased, according to the London Charities' Commissioners, with funds collected "...at or shortly after the date of the Reformation for the endowment of lectures of the Puritanical school of divinity."[2] We are unfortunately unable to go behind this report to check the precise date and purposes of these purchases but it is believed that a lectureship was certainly established in the parish by Edward VI's reign.[3]

The few years of this reign witnessed a remarkable increase in the popularity of these lecturing posts, and imbued London

---

1. City of London Livery Companies Commission, Report and Appendix (1884), ii, 680,697.
2. Endowed Charities (County of London) (1897), vi, 458.
3. VCH. 318. cf. Isabel Calder, A Seventeenth Century Attempt to Purify the Anglican Church, American Historial Review, liii, No.4 (1948), 760-75, who dated the establishment of the lecture 1559. Dorothy Williams, Puritanism in the City Government 1610-1640, Guildhall Miscellany, No.4, Feb.1955, 4, appears to have followed Miss Calder's dating.

citizens with their inexhaustible taste for sermons. The new teaching of the Edwardian bishops with their emphasis on preaching as the medium of salvation, the radicalism of many of the City clergy, and, perhaps above all, the inspiration of Hooper, disposed citizens to employ ministers for preaching purposes alone. Probably only in London could parish lectureships have emerged on any scale at this time, for nowhere else was there a comparable fund of available preachers. "For I saye vnto you," a contemporary wrote, "that the Gospell was never more sincerelye preached in the tyme of the Apostles then it hath bene of late in London; nor neuer more godlye exposicions vppon the Scripture, and that in greate nombre, whereby to drawe vs to Christ Jesus."[1] Lecturers were employed, inter alia,[2] at St. Benet Gracechurch and St. Michael Cornhill in 1549,[3] and at All Hallows Staining in 1551 where the stipend was £4 for the year.[4] At St. Paul's Cathedral, two preachers read lectures four times a week in 1549.[5] The most popular exponent of the weekday lecture was the firebrand John Hooper,

---

1. The Lament acyon of a Christen Agaynst the Cytye of London, made by Roderigo Mors (A.D. 1545), ed. J.M.Cowper, Early English Text Society, No. XXII, (1904), 95.
2. GLMS. 1568, p.34.
3. GLMS. 4071/1, f.34v.
4. GLMS. 4956/2, f.47r.
5. Hooper to Bullinger, June 25/1549, Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, ed. H.Robinson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1846), i, 65.

the leader of the Continental party in England in 1549.[1] According to his own testimony, he was, - "having compassion upon the ignorance of my brethren" -, reading a public lecture twice daily "...to so numerous an audience, that the church cannot contain them."[2] In 1550 he lectured once or twice daily for three months on S.John, Chapter 6 and "A wonderful and most numerous concourse of people attended me, and God was with them ..."[3]

So early in its history, the parish lecture was thus associated with radical Protestantism, and became, certainly in the case of St. Antholin, and in Hooper's church, a platform for the views of the reforming party within the church of England. This was evidently appreciated by the Edwardian authorities who made desultory attempts to control the activities of lecturers. As were all preachers, they were granted preaching licences post-1549 only if they subscribed to Cranmer's articles of religion, articles, however, with which not even Hooper could find fault.[4] A more specific regulation was the ban imposed on weekday lectures in Essex by the royal council in 1550, on the ground that it was "...not convenient that the preachers shulde have liberty so to do, bycause at this

---

1. M.M.Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago 1939), 82.
2. Hooper to Bullinger, June 25/1549 (Original Letters, 1,65.) He did not name the church.
3. Hooper to Bullinger March 27/1550 (ibid. 1,80.)
4. Ibid. December 27/1549. (ibid. 1,71.)

present yt may increase the peoples ydleness,...".[1] The bishop of London sent a letter to the archdeacon of Colchester to warn all preachers that they should confine their preaching to the Sabbath and holydays "...exepte yt be at any buryall or marrage."[2] No similar order is recorded for the London lectures This regulation marks the first official acknowledgement of the existence of a problem that was to prove insoluble even to Archbishop Laud.

Martyrdom, imprisonment, or flight overseas deprived Marian London of the leading preachers of the previous reign, and it seems that parochial lectureships lapsed almost completely between 1553-1558.[3] Indeed, the exercise of a 'lecture' acquired another, more sinister, meaning during these years, as it was used to indicate a clandestine exposition of a text befor a private assembly - an offence as culpable to Bonner as it was later to Parker.[4] This duality survived into the following reign,[5] and accounts for the sharp distinction made by Elizabethans between legitimate lectures delivered publicly in

---

1. Card. Doc. Annals, i,96-7. The ban was imposed on the initiative of Lord Chancellor Rich, "no favourer of the Gospel" (Strype, Parker, i,371.)
2. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 97-8.
3. An exception was the Whittington College lecture, known to be in existence in 1555 (The Diary of Henry Machyn, ed. J.G. Nichols, Camden Soc. 42 (1847), 91.
4. Bishop Bonner's visitation articles 1554 inquired about 'privy lectures' (ibid. i,139 (Article XIII)
5. e.g. Parker's Articles for Canterbury diocese, 1560, against 'secret lecturers'. (W.H.Frere, Visitation Articles and Injunctions, Alcuin Club Collections XVI (1910), iii,84.)

parish or cathedral churches, and illegal 'privy' lectures or conventicles. Although the continuity of parish lectureships was disrupted on the Marian accession, it is likely that the association of the term 'lecture' with the clandestine exercises held by the Protestant congregation in London during these years, served to strengthen its radical bias in the eyes of contemporary citizens.

Bearing in mind this reformist tradition, we can now examine the revival and expansion of parochial lectureships in the years following the Anglican settlement. The most important single influence was that of the returning Marian exiles from their continental refuge, and in no aspect of ecclesiastical life did they exert a more decisive impact than in the dissemination of public preaching in the City. Their virtual monopoly of preaching activity was emphasised by the moderate academic standards and non-preaching tendencies of so many of the existing London incumbents who had survived the Marian and/or Elizabethan purges, and by the co-operation of the ecclesiastical and civic hierarchy which not only rewarded ex-emigrés with some of the choicest City livings, but also frequently called upon them to fill the pulpit at the important public gatherings in Paul's Cross and the Spital.[1]

A by-product of the predominance of reformist preachers was

---

1. cf. Chapter X, pp. 512-13

an increased demand for lectures, Sabbatical or weekday, that would supplement the monthly sermons prescribed by the Queen's Injunctions of 1559. At St. Antholin where, from 1559 onwards, three preachers were employed in reading morning lectures six days a week, the Genevan practice of congregational singing of psalms before the sermon was first introduced in these 6 a.m. services, and spread quickly to other churches in London and elsewhere.[1] Robert Crowley's lecture was perhaps influenced by those read by Bartholomew Traheron at Frankfort where he had spent his years of exile.[2]

Before the crisis of 1565-6, lectureships tended to spring up in those parishes where the incumbent was a known radical, or where the parishioners managed to obtain the services of an 'outside' preacher of reformist views. By 1566, nine ministers are known to have been employed in City churches in a lecturing capacity. Three of these were stationed at St. Antholin; and all three - Crowley, Gough and Philpot - were nonconformists who were deprived in the vestiarian controversy from benefices they held elsewhere in the City, and who, according to John Stow were the "...moaste ernyste withstanders of ye lawes of this realme...consernynge ye ordar of mynystracions, and ye greatest animators of all ye wholl citie to do the lyke, upon who, ye

---

1. Dorothy Williams, loc. cit. 4.
2. For Traheron see DNB.

greatest nomber of other mynyster dyd depend..."[1] John Bartlett, lecturer at Crowley's benefice of St. Giles Cripplegate,[2] was likewise suspended, as was Thomas Gresshop, another itinerant lecturer.[3] A 'readership' was created in the parish church of Christ Church Newgate Street in 1560,[4] and was for five years held by Richard Allen, a young member of the nonconformist party, until he was ejected and, according to a clerical contemporary, betook himself to husbandry.[5] Giles Boskell, the vicar of St. Lawrence Jewry, supplemented his salary by reading lectures three evenings a week to his parishioners;[6] his part in the 1566 controversy was obscure, but it is possible that his resignation from his benefice in the summer of that year, was, like that of Miles Coverdale, not entirely voluntary. More moderate views were held by John Bullingham, lecturer at St. Botolph Aldersgate[7] where the incumbent was a non-preacher;[8]

---

1. Stowe's Memoranda, printed in Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles ed. J.Gardner, Camden Soc. (1880), 139.
2. The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. W.Nicholson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1848), 288.
3. Zurich Letters, ed. H.Robinson, 2nd. series, (Cambridge 1845 147. Gresshop's parish is not known; he may still have been in the household of the Duke of Norfolk where he had been offered a preaching post by Fox c. 1564. (J.F.Mozley, John Foxe and His Book (1940), 77.)
4. St. Barts. Hospital, Hb/1/1 [no fol.].
5. CUL. MS.Mm, 1,29, f.59v.
6. GLMS. 2590/1, p.22.
7. GLMS. 1454, No.68. For Bullinger's views at this time see the summary of a sermon delivered by him in St. Paul's on August 24th, 1566 (Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10, ff.68r.-71v.)
8. Lambeth MS. Tenison 711, No.19. His name was William Sketson (Scotson).

the last of the nine ministers was Henry Wright, who evidently preached orthodox doctrine to his congregation at St. Mary le Bow.[1]

Thomas Wood's letter to Cecil protesting against Parker's suspension of thirty-seven non-subscribing City ministers on 26 March, 1566 throws light both on the encouragement given to radical lecturers by prominent citizens, and of the nature of some of these exercises.[2] Wood was a merchant of substantial means who had exiled himself to Frankfort, and later to Geneva during the Marian régime, and who is known to have kept up his association with the church reformists on his return to London;[3] the importance he attached to the parish lectureship may well reflect the value of the institution as a sounding-board for Puritan proselytism at this time. Parker's action, he complaine to Cecil, meant the "...utter overthrow... of all excersises almost of interpretation of the scripture used every morning and evening in sundry churches within this City." He was particularly concerned about the St. Antholin lectureships, which since the suspension of the regular preachers, had been

---

1. This is suggested by the fact that he retained his living in St. Stephen Walbrook, and was appointed by the bishop to preach at Paul's Cross at the height of the crisis (Bodl. MS. Tanner 50-10, f.49v.)
2. Wood to Cecil, March 29th 1566, Hertfordshire Record Office MS. Gorhambury viii/B/143, ff.13v.-14.v. (I am indebted to Dr. P.Collinson for this reference.).
3. Garrett, op.cit. 343.

precariously maintained "...at five of the clock in the morning by such godly young men as having no spirituall lyvings, were not called before the Commissioners, but how long it will continewe, the Lord knoweth..."[1] The identity of these young men is not known, but amongst them may possibly have been the twenty-one years old John Field who four days previously had been ordained priest by the bishop of London.[2] Wood also referred to a practice in one City church which was a variant of the customary public lecture; at St. Peter's[3] church had been overthrown a "...most frutfull and comfortable exercise named prophesying used once a week...where 2 or 3 hundred were assembled..." No further details are provided, but Wood's terminology suggests an affinity between this exercise, and the prophesyings recently set up in the diocese of Norwich, where groups of ministers came together to discuss a text publicly before a lay congregation.[4]

When we consider that six, possibly seven, of the nine ministers known to have held lecturing positions in City churche in 1566, were ejected by Parker, some impression may be formed of the setback to the development of these parochial

---

1. This is not absolutely accurate, as both Bartlett and Allen were unbeneficed lecturers.
2. GLMS. 9535/1, f.124v.
3. There were five parish churches of this name in the City; the most likely one was St. Peter Cornhill (incumbent John Gough) or St. Peter le Poer (incumbent Robert Crowley).
4. R.W.Dixon, History of the Church of England (Oxford 1902), vi, 7.

institutions. On the whole, however, the institutions themselves were less affected than the personnel they employed. Only one of the existing lectureships lapsed in 1566;[1] the others survived because parishioners were able to obtain replacements for the nonconformists. These often came from the ranks of newly-beneficed ministers in London, selected for these livings by virtue of their blend of academic ability with orthodox opinions.[2] William Palmer, for instance, who succeeded Boskell both as vicar and lecturer of St. Lawrence Jewry, achieved distinction as a conformist theological disputant, and as chancellor of the province of York for over thirty years.[3] Palmer's additional employment as one of the St. Antholin morning lecturers,[4] suggests that even this traditional Puritan stronghold had temporarily lost its radical colour.

Parish lectureships post-1566 thus lost their dominantly left-wing character. This was not because fewer radicals tended to use this platform; indeed they were henceforward driven by Anglican policy steadily closer to the fringes of the established church, where in many cases only a parish lectureship was left open to them. The infiltration of orthodox clergy into lecturing positions was rather the result of the

---

1. St. Botolph Aldersgate.
2. cf. Chapter X, pp. 510-12
3. DNB.
4. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50, 10, f.63v.

improving preaching standards of the London ministry as a whole, who were increasingly able to satisfy the appetite of citizens for weekday as well as Sunday sermons. Lectureships were able to develop more spontaneously, and were no longer dependent on the initiative of Puritan-minded clergymen and the support of their lay sympathisers.

The surviving records do not indicate any sudden acceleration in the number established between 1566-1572. Of those already created, the endowed positions at St. Antholin[1] and St. Michael Paternoster Row[2] (formerly Whittington College) continued to flourish, as did those at St. Lawrence Jewry[3] and Christ Church Newgate Street,[4] where the preacher was paid by the governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, the impropriate rectors of the benefice. The lectureship at St. Botolph Aldersgate[5] lapsed for a time, but was resuscitated in 1569, and survived fairly continuously until the end of the reign. It is probable that John Field at St. Giles Cripplegate upheld the

---

1. Ibid. f63v. Not until 1574, the date of the earliest surviving church warden accounts, do we have any details concerning the preachers employed in this parish. For a list, see Appendix C.
2. Thomas Sampson to Burgley, Feb.13th 1575 (Landd.MS.19,72). Birchet, the attempted assassin of Hawkins in 1573, had just left one of Sampson's lectures at Whittington College (Knappen, op.cit 243.).
3. GLMS.2590/1,p.25. In 1570 the vestry departed from parochial custom by inviting an 'outsider', the Puritan, Edward Dering, to read the lecture. (p.33). There is no indication that he accepted the post; his residence in Cambridge (DNB.) and the smallness of the stipend offered (£10 p.a.) may have been two good reasons.
4. St. Barts. Hospital, Hb/1/2 [no fol.]
5. GLMS. 1454, No.72.

lecturing tradition of his predecessors, Crowley and Bartlett.[1] Meanwhile, new lectureships were created in St. Benet Gracechurch Street (1571) where the preacher was the ardent young radical incumbent, William Wager;[2] St. Dunstan in the East (1572), where the vestry offered an attractive salary of £30 p.a.;[3] St. Mary Aldermanbury (c.1572),[4] and St. Andrew Holborn (c.1569).[5] Another left-wing position was set up in Holy Trinity Minories, probably in 1569.[6] Here, the first full-time lecturers were William Bonham and Nicholas Crane, both ministers associated with the early separatist movement in London, and who had been granted a licence to read public lectures by Grindal on their release from prison in April 1569.[7] Although the post fell into abeyance on their re-incarceration for nonconformity in the following year, it appears to have been revived shortly afterwards, and maintained a tempestuous and intermittent existence for a generation.

In sharp contrast to the gradual extension of the system

---

1. Field's association with St. Giles Cripplegate is suggested by the DNB., and corroborated by his appeals in the Minories on behalf of poor parishioners of Cripplegate (E.M.Tomlinson, A History of the Minories (1907),375). A daughter was born to Field in Cripplegate in 1570 (GLMS.6318/1, f.26r.)
2. GLMS. 1568, p.223.
3. GLMS. 4887, p.197.
4. GLMS. 3570/1, f.3v.
5. The records of this parish for the period have not survived, but there is a reference to a lecture there in LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.232r.
6. Tomlinson, op.cit. 214. Tomlinson wildly suggested that "...the lectures were the Homilies".
7. Grindal, Remains, 318.

before 1572, the next decade witnessed a remarkable acceleration. Seventeen City parishes were employing lecturers in 1577, and by 1583, the number had risen to a minimum of thirty, three times as many as the 1572 figures. The great majority of these posts were financed, as will be seen,[1] not by endowment, but largely by the contributions of parishioners, - an eloquent testimony of their insatiable appetite for sermons. With the possible exception of St. Giles Cripplegate and St. Michael Paternoster Row, of which we have no information, all the 1572 lectureships were still functioning in 1583, although that at St. Botolph Aldersgate had suffered a year's relapse in 1579.[2] New positions had been established in St. Christopher le Stocks (1577),[3] St. Helen Bishopsgate (1576),[4] St. Lawrence Pountney (1581),[5] St. Mary Woolchurch (1579),[6] St. Mary Woolnoth (1577),[7] St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street (1576),[8] St. Michael Cornhill (1575),[9] St. Peter Cornhill (1574),[10] and St. Peter West Cheap (1583).[11] The 1583 total also included a number of lectures brought to light

---

1. Infra. pp. 423-34, passim
2. GLMS. 1454, No.81.
3. GLMS. 4424, p.8.
4. GLMS. 6836, f.23v.
5. GLMS. 3907/1, [no fol.].
6. GLMS. 1013/1, f.32r.
7. GLMS. 1002/1, f.185v.
8. GLMS. 2596/1, f.157v.
9. GLMS. 4072/1, f.18v.
10. GLMS. 4165/1, p.2.
11. GLMS. 645/1, f.114r.

by the enquiries made at the episcopal visitation of that year, but which may already have been in existence before that date. These were attached to the parishes of All Hallows Barking, St. Anne Blackfriars, St. Augustine, St. Botolph Aldgate, St. Clement Eastcheap, St. Katherine Coleman, and St. Magnus.[1] Other parishes are known to have appointed lecturers during the post-1572 decade, but the precise date of foundation is not known. Casual information from parochial or miscellaneous sources makes it clear that lectureships existed in St. Martin Orgar (c.1579),[2] St. Margaret New Fish Street (pre-1577),[3] All Hallows Staining, where a 1575 reference was the first since the pioneer lecture set up there in the Edwardian period,[4] St. Margaret Lothbury (pre-1574),[5] St. Mary Aldermary (c.1581), a position which John Field held for some years,[6] and St. Mary le Bow (c.1581).[7]

Important changes took place in the parish of Christ Church Newgate Street at this time. The governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, the lay rectors, were bound by the terms of their foundation in 1546 to maintain five priests in the parish to help the vicar to sing and celebrate service and minister the

---

1. GLMS. 9537/5, [no fol.].
2. GLMS. 959/1, f.42v.
3. GLMS. 1176/1, [no fol.].
4. GLMS. 4958/2, f.13r.
5. GLMS. 4352/1, f.26r.
6. For the dating of Field's lectureship here, see Chapter XI, p.544, note 2.
7. SP. ii, 220.

sacraments, each at a stipend of £8 p.a.[1] These 'singing men' were a somewhat anomalous institution in mid-Elizabethan London where few vestries were prepared to support conductors;[2] their unpopularity with the inhabitants of Christ Church was reflected in the persistent complaint made of their behaviour to the governors.[3] These reached a climax in 1581 when, following parochial allegations of disorders by "...Diverse singenge men which Dothe rather hurt and hinder the service in the churche then do any good, and that also one of them is a Drunckard," and that only one of them was a priest as laid down in the royal foundation, the governors ordered their dismissal and the substitution of five other ministers "...which shall be preachers" in their place.[4] The order was endorsed by the Court of Aldermen, and five City preachers were selected for what in practice were lecturing positions in the parish. One of the victims protested to the Queen against his arbitrary removal, and, following enquiries made on her behalf to the Mayor, an investigation was made by the bishop of London and the Master of

---

1. The indenture made on December 27th, 1546 between Henry VIII and the Lord Mayor, Corporation and Citizens, is deposited in the Record Office ofSt. Bartholomew's Hospital. For a summary see N.Moore, The History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital (1918), ii, 155-6.
2. Payments in CWA to 'conducts' are rare post-1570. For an exception see an appointment made in St. Michael Cornhill 1592. (GLMS. 4072/1, f.55v.).
3. St. Barts. Hospital, Ha1/2, ff.32v., 156v.
4. Ibid. ff.181v-184r. Prominent on behalf of the parishioners was Thomas Fanshaw, Remembrancer of the exchequer.

Requests.[1] Apparently satisfied that the change had not infringed the terms of the foundation, they confirmed the decision of the governors, and the preachers survived, at times somewhat precariously, for the next fourteen years.[2] The parish thus found itself the beneficiary of weekly lectures delivered by four well-known preachers endowed from funds provided for non-preaching purposes.

The extensive facilities for hearing sermons in the London of the early-1580s gives some justification to the sceptical reaction of the Lord Mayor to the abortive proposals made by the privy council in 1581 for the establishment of a network of lectures in the City as a means of withstanding Roman Catholic infiltration.[3] Aylmer ascribed the Mayor's lack of enthusiasm to the "might of Mammon",[4] but in fact the known existence of some thirty parish lectures at this time made such a scheme impractical and, indeed, superfluous.

By 1589, the number of parish lectureships had increased slightly to a total of thirty-three, by the additional establishment of posts at St. Alban Wood Street,[5] St. Andrew

---

1. Analytical Index to...The Remembrancia 1579-1664, ed. W.H. Overall (1878), 126-130.
2. Ha. 1/3, f.144v.
3. Analytical Index, 364-87.
4. Aylmer to Burghley, September 8th 1581 [Lansd. MS. 33,23.].
5. GLMS. 7673/1, f.5r.

Undershaft,[1] St. Bartholomew Exchange,[2] St. Bride,[3] St. Katherine Cree,[4] St. Nicholas Acon,[5] St. Olave Jewry,[6] St. Stephen Coleman Street,[7] and, possibly, St. Stephen Walbrook.[8] Some of the existing ones appear to have lapsed temporarily either because of shortage of funds or because of the death or removal of the preacher. Amongst the latter were those enjoyed by members of the London Presbyterian classis attached to the parishes of St. Mary Aldermary, St. Mary le Bow, All Hallows the Less, All Hallows Staining, and St. Katherine Coleman, who were all ejected by Whitgift and Aylmer post-1583.[9] At St. Margaret Pattens,[10] St. Botolph Bishopsgate,[11] and St. Martin Ludgate[12] short-lived lectureships had been installed *circa* 1588, 1583, and 1585 respectively, but were apparently defunct in 1589.

The 1589 total - which meant that almost a third of all the parishes in the London area were hiring preachers to deliver

---

1. GLMS. 9537/7, f.110r.
2. The Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St. Bartholomew Exchange...1567-1676 ed. E.Freshfield (privately printed 1890),1
3. GLMS. 9537/7, f.105r.
4. GLMS. 9234/2, f.44r.
5. GLMS. 9537/7, f.120v.
6. Ibid. f.108v.
7. GLMS. 4457/2, f.4r.
8. GLMS. 594/1, p.2. [date uncertain].
9. See Chapter XI, *sub.* The Battle Joined.
10. GLMS. 4570/2, p.174.
11. GLMS. 4524/1, f.48r.
12. In his testament, Stephen Gosson referred to his position as lecturer in this parish before he became the minister at Stepney in February 1585. (W.Ringler, Stephen Gosson: A Biographical and Critical Study, Princeton Studies in English, 25 (1942), 42.).

weekday and Sunday sermons that were in no way a compulsory requirement, turned out to be an approximate ceiling figure for the Elizabethan period. There were certainly some fluctuations in the 1590s, as the majority of lectureships were still dependent on voluntary subscriptions, but those that expired, as at St. Andrew Undershaft, St. Andrew Holborn, St. Nicholas Acon, St. Katherine Cree, and possibly St. Peter West Cheap,[1] or became temporarily dormant, as at St. Bartholomew Exchange,[2] St. Augustine,[3] and St. Michael Cornhill,[4] were replaced by new creations in other parishes which might have acquired a zealous preaching incumbent, or welcomed new vestry men of substantial means and pious intentions. George Phillips, Puritan divine, was, as far as it is known, the first lecturer to be employed by the parishioners of St. Edmund Lombard Street, where he was preaching in 1590;[5] at St. Alphage, a regular lecturer was first appointed in the same year,[6] while at St. Andrew Hubbard the office was first mentioned in the parish records six years later.[7] Similar precedents occurred in St. Gabriel Fenchurch (1598),[8] St. James Clerkenwell (1598),[9] St. Peter ad Vincula

---

1. Between 1591-1603 no references to lectures in these parishes have been found.
2. Although periodic proposals were made, not until 1601 was the lecture revived. (Freshfield, op.cit. 45).
3. No lecturer in 1592 visitation, but position renewed by 1597 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, f.161v.).
4. GLMS. 4072/1, f.76v.
5. GLMS. 9234/2, f.112r.
6. GLMS. 1432/3, f.35v.
7. GLMS. 1279/2, f.160v.
8. GLMS. 9537/9, f.181r.
9. Ibid. f.159v.

(1596),[1] St. Andrew Wardrobe (1596),[2] and St. Benet Paul's Wharf (1601),[3] so that the sum of these new creations, taken in conjunction with the lectures at St. Mary Aldermary,[4] St. Martin Ludgate,[5] St. Martin Vintry[6] and St. Stephen Walbrook[7] which were resuscitated towards the end of the century, more than balanced the defections that occurred during the decade.[8]

The non-survival of the 1601 Liber Visitationis prevents an adequate census of parish lectures at the end of the reign,[9] but the close approximation between the 1589 and 1598 totals suggests that, within the existing conditions of the London ministry, these figures approached saturation level in preaching demands. Altogether, fifty-six parishes - almost exactly half the total number under study - are known to have employed lecturers at some date between 1560-1601, but no more than a maximum of three-fifths of these posts are believed to have been

---

1. GLMS. 9234/6, f.89v.
2. GLMS. 9234/6, f.72v.
3. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1601-2, f.15r.
4. GLMS. 6574, f.3v.
5. GLMS. 9537/9, f.160r.
6. Ibid. [no fol.].
7. GLMS. 594/1, p.48.
8. To these defections may be added the dismissal of the five preachers at Christ Church, Newgate Street and their replacement by singing priests by order of the High Commission in 1595 (St. Barts. Hospital, Hc.2/3, f.144v.). Subsequently, the parishioners were apparently able to maintain two lecturers from their own resources. (GLMS. 9537/9, f.159r.).
9. The existence of twenty-nine lecturers in London in 1601 can be ascertained from the CWA. or VM. of the fifty odd parishes whose records survive for this date.

active at the same time. At best, 30% of the City vestries were simultaneously experimenting with this novel form of ecclesiastical promotion.

(ii) DISTRIBUTION AND PERSONNEL

To what extent was the establishment of a parish lecture an attempt by parishioners to fill a spiritual gap created by a non-preaching and/or non-resident incumbent? How far were lectureships confined to parishes occupied by clergymen of this calibre? The following table, which gives the total number of known lectureships at specified dates, the number occupied by ministers other than the incumbent or curate of the parish, and the preaching and residential status of the incumbents of parishes where the lecturer was an 'outsider', may help to clarify this point.

1 DATE	2 TOTAL NO. OF LECTURE-SHIPS	NO. OCCUPIED BY OUTSIDERS	3 NON-RESIDENT INCUMBENTS	NON-PREACHING INCUMBENTS	RESIDENT AND PREACHING INCUMBENTS	STATUS INCUMBE UNCERTA
1566	7	6	2	1	2	1
1572	9	6	4	1	-	1
1577	17	9	5	1	2	1
1583	29	23	9	5	8	-
1589	33	19	8	7	4	-
1592	27	14	5	6	2	1
1598	35	16	5	6	4	1

[For details of Footnotes 1, 2 and 3, see following page].

1. Six yearly intervals have been taken for purposes of convenience. The dates post-1577 coincide with those of episcopal visitations when most information is available. As the Libri Visitationum for 1595 and 1601 have not survived, it was thought advisable to include both the 1589 and 1592 figures.
2. Chief sources have been the Libri Visitationum (lecturers first cited 1583), church-wardens accounts, and vestry minutes. These figures are as complete as can be ascertained from extant material but should not necessarily be regarded as maximum totals. Eighteen of the London parishes were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and cannot be checked from visitatorial sources; the records of some of these parishes survive, but in other churches in the deanery of Arches no more than fragmentary pieces of evidence are available.
3. i.e. ministers not otherwise attached to the parish.

We are concerned at this point with the status of the incumbent in parishes where the lecturer was an outsider. In the majority of cases, an outsider was employed by parishioners either because the incumbent was non-resident, or because he was a non-preaching resident.[1] In each of the years specified, at

---

1. 1566: incumbents of Christ Church (n.r.), St. Antholin (n.r.), St. Botolph Aldersgate (n.p.).
1572: incumbents of St. Antholin (n.r.), Christ Church (n.r.), St. Michael Paternoster Row (n.r.), St. Dunstan in East (n.r.), St. Botolph Aldersgate (n.p.).
1577: incumbents of St. Christopher Stocks (n.r.), St.Antholin (n.r.), St. Margaret New Fish St. (n.r.), St. Dunstan in East (n.r.), Holy Trinity Minories (n.r.), St. Mary Woolnoth (n.p.).
1583: incumbents of Christ Church (n.r.), St. Mary Aldermary (n.r.), St. Andrew Holborn (n.r.), All Hallows Barking (n.r.), St. Antholin (n.r.), St. Dunstan in East (n.r.), Holy Trinity Minories (n.r.), St. Martin Ludgate (n.r.), St. Magnus (n.r.).
1 All Hallows Staining (n.p.), St. Augustine (n.p.), St. Katherine Coleman (n.p.), St. Mary Woolchurch (n.p.), St. Botolph Aldgate (n.p.).
1589: incumbents of Christ Church (n.r.), St. Andrew Holborn (n.r.), All Hallows Barking (n.r.), St. Antholin (n.r.), St. Dunstan in East (n.r.), Holy Trinity Minories (n.r.), St. Magnus (n.r.), St. Nicholas Acon (n.r.), St.Augustine (n.p.), St. Mary Woolchurch (n.p.), St. Botolph Aldgate (n.p.), St. Andrew Undershaft (n.p.), St. Olave Jewry (n.p.), St. Katherine Cree (n.p.), St. Bartholomew Exchange (n.p.).
1592: incumbents of Christ Church (n.r.), St. Andrew Holborn (n.r.), All Hallows Barking (n.r.), St. Dunstan in East (n.r.), St. Alphage (n.r.), St. Augustine (n.p.), St.Mary Woolchurch (n.p.), St. Botolph Aldgate (n.p.), St. Olave Jewry (n.p.), St. Katherine Cree (n.p.).
1598: incumbents of Christ Church (n.r.), All Hallows Barking (n.r.), St.Dunstan in East (n.r.), St. Martin Ludgate (n.r.), St. Martin Vintry (n.r.), St. Mary Woolchurch (n.p.), St. Botolph Aldgate (n.p.), St. Augustine (n.p.), St. Gabriel Fenchurch (n.p.), St. James Clerkenwell (n.p. St. Katherine Coleman (n.p.).
[n.r. = non-resident; n.p.= non-preacher].

least half of the 'outside' lecturers satisfied a preaching demand by parishioners that was neither provided by the incumbent nor enforced by the ecclesiastical authorities. In 1572, possibly all six such lecturers performed as substitutes for 'dumb' or absentee parsons; the later figures showed a little variation, but with the exception of the 1583 total, there is no indication of a proportionate increase in the number of 'outside' lecturers to supplement rather than to substitute for the incumbent or his curate. In 1583, eight parishes where the incumbent is known to have been both resident and a preacher, nevertheless employed outsiders.[1] This form of discrimination, more noticeable in 1583 than at any other time, can be largely attributed to the popularity of the unbeneficed Puritan nonconformists who had not yet been silenced by Whitgift and Aylmer.[2] By 1589 when most of them had been ejected, the number of parishes who employed an 'outside' preacher as well as

---

1. St. Margaret New Fish St. (Rector Wm. Cotton, lecturer Th. Edmunds); St. Michael Cornhill (R. Rich. Mathew, lecturer Ed. Leyfield); St. Mary Bow (R. H.Cole, lecturer Th. Barber); St. Margaret Lothbury (R. A.Shepherd, lecturer R.Crowley); St. Anne Blackfriars (PC. Fr.Scarlet, lecturer St.Egerton); St. Clement Eastcheap (R. R.Hailes, lecturer Th.Edmunds); St. Mary Woolnoth (R. Th.Buckmaster, lecturer Th.Edmunds); Holy Trinity Minories (curate Andrews, lecturer Wm.Banar).
2. Edmunds, Barber, Egerton, Crowley, and Banar were all Puritans of varying shades. To hold such a supplementary post was of course consistent with the Puritan concept that "...in everie Church...there ought to be both a teacher or reader in divinitie, and a pastor, that is, a shephard or preacher". (SP. i.132).

a resident, preaching incumbent had fallen to less than a quarter of the total; there was little variation from this proportion in the following decade.

As a rule, we may sum up, 'outside' lecturers were employed in those parishes where the incumbent failed to satisfy the preaching needs of the parishioners. Exceptions were not rare, and were attributable in most cases to the vestry's preference for a well-known outsider who more often than not was Puritan in sympathy. This leads us to the larger question of the distribut on of London parish lectureships between the incumbent his curate, and the outsider who was either beneficed elsewhere or occupied himself as an unbeneficed itinerant preacher. This can best be shown in the following table.

DATE	TOTAL NO. OF PARISH LECTURESHIPS	NO. HELD BY INCUMBENT OF PARISH	NO. HELD BY CURATE OF PARISH	NO. HELD BY OUTSIDER[1]	UNCERTAIN
1566	7	1	-	6	-
1572	9	3	-	6	-
1577	17	6	-	9	2
1583	30	6	-	23	1
1589	33	10	4	19	-
1592	27	11	2	14	-
1598	35	15	4	16	-

[For details of Footnote see following page]

1. It should be said that the ratio of outsiders to incumbents or curates from 1583 onwards may be exaggerated. The Libri Visitationum from which the figures have in part been drawn, name outsiders only, as they were not concerned whether the incumbent lectured or otherwise. In a substantial number of cases it has been possible to cross-check from parochial sources, but all of them cannot be covered in this way.

These figures bring out the change in the character of the personnel between the early years of the reign and the last decade of the century. Whereas only one out of the seven parish lectureships in existence in 1566 was occupied by the incumbent of the same parish, no more than sixteen parishes out of thirty-four in 1598 employed an outsider. The infiltration of incumbents into the lecturing position established by their parishioners, developed steadily in the 1570s, and although in 1583 they apparently only amounted to one-fifth of the total number, they had (if we add the curates who were lecturers in the same parish to their total) greatly consolidated their positions by the 1590s and were entrenched on at least a fifty-fifty basis with the erstwhile dominant 'outside' lecturer.

The distribution changeover was in part a consequence of periodic action by the ecclesiastical authorities against lecturers of nonconformist tendencies, the majority of whom in the early years of the reign lectured in parishes outside their own cures, and later were not beneficed at all.[1] Parker and Grindal's replacement of nonconformists by orthodox preachers in 1566 gave incumbents some hold on the lectureships then in existence, as did the action taken by Aylmer and Whitgift post-1583 against Field and his Presbyterian colleagues. Without an improvement in their own quality, however, London incumbents

---

1. cf. Appendix C.

could not have exploited these opportunities so effectively. As is shown elsewhere,[1] the Elizabethan period saw a steady increase in the distribution of graduates and licensed preachers among the beneficed clergy of the City; parishioners were thus able to a greater extent to call upon the incumbent of the parish to perform the lecturing duties they required. As we have seen, the appointment of an outsider was an infrequent occurrence if the incumbent was qualified and available. The entry of curates into lecturing positions,- the first known appointment was that of Hugh Smith at St. Michael Cornhill in 1584[2] -,suggests a like improvement in the quality of this class of clergyman.

Not least among the implications of the changed distribution was the effect on the 'outsider' type of lecturer. An analysis of this type is important because it included a new class of clergyman unregulated by existing church law, a class that lived by preaching alone, and which, until Aylmer grew aware of its potential threat, enjoyed an immunity from hierarchical control denied to other ministerial ranks. A recent ecclesiastical historian has thus described the class:

> "...the lecturer was a kind of popular freelance, exempt from parochial cares and parochial ministrations, and less amenable in practice than in theory to episcopal supervision

---

1. Chapters III and IV.
2. GLMS. 4072/1, f.28r.

and control. He satisfied a genuine demand; but he was an anomaly in the ecclesiastical system."[1]

DATE	2 A TOTAL OUTSIDERS	3 B NO. BENEFICED ELSEWHERE	C NO. CURACY ELSEWHERE	D NO. UNCERTAIN	4 E NO. UNATTACHED	5 F LATER BENEFICE OR CURACY
1566	8	4	-	-	4	2
1572	8	3	-	3	2	1
1577	11	5	-	4	2	1
1583	25	8	1	2	14	7
1589	21	8	2	-	11	5
1592	18	8	1	2	7	2
1598	18	5	1	-	12	4

1. C.Smyth, Church and Parish: Studies in Church Problems, illustrated from the Parochial History of St. Margaret's Westminster (1955), 113.
2. These totals vary slightly from those in the earlier tables because in a few cases more than one lecturer was employed in the same parish; St. Antholin employed three preachers throughout the reign (but only two outsiders in 1589), while Christ Church had four 'outside' preachers between 1580-1695 (the other was also curate of the parish), and had two outsiders in 1598. The totals are also affected by the plurality of lectures read by Edmunds (1583), Cheston (1583), Leyfield (1583), Anderson (1586, 1589), Nunne (1586), and the three positions held by Alsop in 1598. A full list of outsiders is given in Appendix C.
3. To include perpetual curates as well as rectors and vicars. Generally, their livings lay in London, but on occasion a City lecturer has been found to be the non-resident parson of a country benefice, e.g. J.Fabian, lecturer at St. Andrew Holborn in 1589, was rector of Great Wartley in Essex (Alumni Cantab,1, ii,115); Edward Spendlove as well as being a morning lecturer

[continued on following page

at St. Antholin c.1594-1630, was presented to the vicarage of Newham Bordbin, Northants, in 1596 (Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.11r.) and was perhaps vicar of Badby in the same year (H.I. Longden, Northamptonshire and Rutland Clergy from 1500, xiii, (1942), 15.

4. i.e. those preachers not known to hold any other ecclesiastical promotion.

5. This column relates to column 'E' only, and has no connection with the rest of the table. It states the number of unattached lecturers who are known to have later accepted a living, and is intended to show that by no means all these preachers were nonconformists reluctant or unable to take a benefice.

Reduced to these divisions, the corps of lecturers that flourished in Elizabethan London present a rather different impression from the solid phalanx shown in column 'A'. Many were clergymen with a benefice or curacy elsewhere, to whom a lectureship was additional to their normal pastoral duties in their own cures. They were men selected for this purpose by virtue of the preaching reputation they had already established in their own livings. Until 1583, they were often Puritan in sympathy, for such men tended to be specialist preachers popular with citizens. Three out of the four 1566 lecturers who held benefices elsewhere, for instance, were deprived by Parker for their opposition to vestiarian uniformity,[1] while in 1583 at least five are known to have been at best semi-conformists.[2] After this date the new subscription regulations made it difficult for a conformed radical to obtain a London living, and this may account for the lower ratio of beneficed ministers ~~being~~ employed as lecturers elsewhere in the later part of the reign.[3]

Puritans may have sought as many pulpits as possible for propaganda purposes, but other considerations also played their

---

1. Crowley, Gough, and Philpot.
2. Crowley, Gattacre, Castleton, Haughton, and Bright. (cf. Appendix C for their positions).
3. Beneficed clergymen of known Puritan inclination who served as lecturers in other parishes post-1583 included Castleton (St. Olave Jewry 1589); J.Oliver (St. Antholin 1591-2), D.Dee (Christ Church 1584-95), T.Gattacre (Christ Church 1579-93), Th.Edmunds (St. Margaret New Fish St. 1582-90).

part in determining an incumbent to add to his own pastoral tasks by preaching bi-weekly (or more) in another man's parish. Chief of these was the financial incentive. As will be seen, a lectureship was often a lucrative employment with a stipend invaluable to a minister of one of the poorer London parishes which could not furnish their own lectureship. Such a man as Christoper Rosedale, rector of a benefice valued at £8.6.8d. in the Valor Ecclesiasticus,[1] was obliged to look elsewhere to supplement his income, and, provided he possessed suitable qualifications, a lectureship was the obvious solution.[2] A preaching post must have been the means of keeping more than one incumbent solvent in a city notorious for the reluctance of parishioners to pay their full tithes.

Column 'E' deals with those lecturers not known to have held either a living or curacy on the dates specified in the table. This was the class of lecturers which gave most concern to the ecclesiastical authorities, being least vulnerable to their control. The unattached parish lecturer was a new phenomenon unknown to existing canon law, and could not be regulated by the disciplinary system that covered the ranks of

---

1. St. Benet Sherehog (R. 1578-c.82).
2. Rosedale was curate at St. Antholin (1577-c.1583) as well as lecturer at Christ Church (1582-83) before he was presented by his patron, the Earl of Hertford, to the rectory of Somerton, Somerset, in 1582 (sub Rosvall) (Somerset Incumbents, ed. F.W.Weaver (Bristol 1889), 184.).

the beneficed clergy and their assistant curates.[1] Whereas lecturers who also held livings could be controlled by virtue of their latter positions, no check could be made on the activities of the unattached preacher so long as he remained in the same diocese, possessed the appropriate instruments, and was equipped with a preaching licence.

This loophole in the ecclesiastical system had been exploited by clerical reformers from the time of Edward VI onwards, but not until nonconformists post-1572 developed a reluctance to take up beneficed posts within the Church of England in its existing imperfect state, did it begin to assume an active threat to the ecclesiastical establishment. Thus, although four lecturers in 1566 held no other promotion, the reason lay not in a deliberate boycott, for we know that two of them shortly afterwards obtained livings, while a third had earlier held a perpetual curacy.[2] Likewise in 1572 and 1577, one of the two unattached preachers later gained preferment.[3] A lectureship was as useful at that time - as it was throughout the reign - to the aspiring young cleric who sought temporary employment in London while awaiting a presentation to a living,

---

1. "...a new body severed from the ancient clergy of England, as being neither parsons, vicars or curates". (1622 Directions, Gee and Hardy, op.cit. 518).
2. J.Bullingham (R. of St. Mary Magdalene Milk St. 1566-71); Th. Gresshop (R. of Agmondersham, Bucks, 1571); R.Allen (PC. of St. Katherine Kree 1560-c.1562).
3. Wm.Ashbold (R. of St. Peter Cornhill 1575-1622); Thomas Cobhead (curate of Holy Trinity Minories 1578).

as it was to the Puritan looking for a platform that did not carry with it other ministerial duties than the delivery of sermons.

As column 'E' shows, the number of unattached lecturers rose during Aylmer's tenure of office. Not all were radicals - some, like the dramatist Stephen Gosson,[1] and Richard Allison,[2] later a chaplain to the Queen, occupied themselves temporarily in anticipation of a more secure form of livelihood, while to others, such as Mathew Heaton, the preacher at St. Andrew Holborn in 1583, a parish lecture was no more than a pis aller.[3] A powerful nucleus remained, however, of prominent nonconformist who could not comply with the conditions attached to the acceptance of a benefice or curacy following Whitgift's subscription regulations in 1583, and who exerted considerable influence in one or more lecturing positions. In 1583 several of them, including Field, Barber, Edmunds, Crooke, Egerton, and

---

1. Lecturer at St. Martin Ludgate 1584, curate and lecturer at Stepney 1585, vicar of Sandridge, Herts. 1586 (Ringler op.cit. 42). For his title to the cure of Stepney see GLMS. 9535/2,f.29
2. Lecturer at St. Nicholas Acon 1589 (GLMS. 9537/7, f.120v.); rector of St. Thomas Apostle 1592; V. of St. Leonard Shoreditch 1596 (Henn, 301, 392).
3. For the terms of his appointment in 1583 see GLMS. 4249, f.235v. In 1584 (or 1585) a petition was delivered to the archbishop of Canterbury on Heaton's behalf by the parishioners of St. Andrew Holborn, praying that he be provided "...of some competent and certayne Lyvinge". (Lambeth C.M.VI,No.90.). One of his name obtained the livings of Cretingham and Framsden in Suffolk in 1589 (R.F.Bullen, Catalogue of Beneficed Clergy of Suffolk 1551-1631, 13.).

Cheston,[1] were members of the Presbyterian classis that existed in London,[2] while others like William Banar,[3] Eusebius Paget,[4] and the Scot, Duncan Anderson,[5] though not apparently affiliated to the group, were radicals of some reputation. These men, according to the Anglican apologist, Peter Heylyn;

"...were raised [not] so much out of care and conscience, for training up the people in the wayes of Faith and Piety, as to advance a Faction, and to alienate the peoples mindes from the Government and Forms of Worship here by Law established. For these Lecturers having no dependance upon the Bishops, not taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience to them, nor subscribing to the doctrine and established Ceremonies, made it their work to please those Patrons, on whom arbitrary maintenance they were planted, and consequently to carry on the Puritan interest, which their Patron drove at..."[6]

Aylmer had inquired about the employment of parish

---

1. For their positions at this time, see Appendix C.
2. The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. R.G.Usher, Camden Soc. 3rd.series, viii (1905), xxviii.
3. In 1583 he was apparently preaching alternatively in the Minories and in St. Osith in Essex, and was suspended at the visitation (LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-4, 1,f.9r.)
4. Parish not known. Ibid. v.f.32r. At one time he was a member of the Northampton classis (Usher, op.cit. xxix).
5. He was lecturer at St. Botolph Aldgate 1583-86, and at the Minories in 1586 until his committal before the High Commissioners (GLMS. 9537/6, f.118v.).
6. P.Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus (1668), 9. Heylyn's criticism, intended to cover the whole class of lecturers, can only apply, as we have seen, to that particular section which held no other ecclesiastical promotion.

lecturers who had no preaching licence in his visitation articles of 1577,[1] but not for another two years did he secure the authority of the privy council for a new method of controlling lecturers. A letter was sent to the archbishop of Canterbury on January 17, 1580, protesting against the division in the ministry between "reading" and "ministering" ministers, and "preachers and no-sacrament ministers", and ordering all preachers to administer the Holy Communion in their own persons at certain times of the year.[2] Aylmer, who, according to Robert Beale was responsible for this order and obtained the council's approval by highly dubious means,[3] followed it up by an exhaustive inquiry of the position of lecturers within the archdeaconry of London.[4] Church wardens were asked whether their parsons read weekly or monthly lectures in their own parishes or elsewhere; if not, was any

---

1. W.P.M.Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, Alcuin Club Collections XXVI (1924), ii, 48 (No.12.).
2. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 440-1. Nonconformist preachers could no longer avoid using the Prayer Book.
3. Addit. MS. 48039, f.21r. "This was a fetche of the Bishopp of London, practised as it was thought to suppresse the Readers [lecturers] in London". Field, in his letter to Gilby, February 28, 1581, also regarded Aylmer as responsible for the regulation (CUL. MS.Mm, 1,43,23. p.446). Beale alleged that the order was procured by some of the privy councillors "... without any resolucion or debatinge of the matter at the Table ...", and was issued under the High Commission seal "vv,very muche resembling that of the Counsell". In fact, 9 Councillors, including Burghley, Hatton, and Walsingham, signed the letter. (Card. Doc. Annals, i, 441.).
4. Kennedy, op.cit. ii, 106-7.

other minister employed in this capacity, and if so, was he beneficed, and did he on occasion administer the sacraments.

Despite the anxiety expressed by leading Puritans,[1] however, the new regulations do not appear to have been rigorously enforced before 1583.[2] Aylmer at his general visitation in the summer of 1580 warned outsiders not to interfere in parishes where the incumbent was a preacher,[3] but did not apparently feel equipped to take disciplinary action at a time when the privy council was proposing an extensive panel of preachers in the City.[4] In 1583, for the first time, all unattached lecturers were cited to the episcopal visitation, where their credentials and their willingness to administer the Communion were checked.[5] The immunity of the lecturer was most

---

1. e.g. J.Field to Anthony Gilby, February 28th, 1581. CUL. MS.Mm, 1,43,23, p.446. By enforcing participation in the Communion service, declared Field, the bishop "...forestauleth many good men, either to throwe them out, or else to gravell the Consciences, that they may stick in the same filth that he doth, of superstitious Ceremonies."
2. According to Field (ibid, p.446), Eusebius Paget who at that time held a City lectureship, was "...of late greveously complained of...whereby great troble is lyke to ensue"; but he was still preaching in London in 1583, as were several other members of the classis. (For Paget's lecture see LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, V, f.32r.
3. Aylmer to Walsingham, March 11th, 1583, (Egerton MS.1693, f.103r.).
4. This is confirmed by Beale's observation that proceedings were 'stayed' post-1580 "...untill it was now [1583-4] revyved agayne." (Addit. MS. 48039, f.21r.)
5. GLMS. 9537/5 passim. The articles do not survive, but it is clear from the 'detecta' that they included one about the administration of Holy Communion by lecturers (LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, vi, f.5r.).

severely damaged by the articles of subscription issued by Whitgift in 1583, which required all preachers, beneficed or otherwise, to comply with certain propositions, the most troublesome of which to nonconformists was obedience to all forms of service prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.[1] Subscription, if thoroughly applied, was the most effective answer to the Puritan enclave, and several, including Field, Barber, and Egerton, were ejected and suspended from preaching on those grounds in the following three years.[2]

The subscription regulations and that on the periodic administration of the Holy Communion, were retained in later visitation articles, and permanently embodied in Anglican canon law in 1604.[3] It was not a completely water-tight method of control, for prominent nonconformists were still to be found in parish lectureships during the later part of the reign. Stephen Egerton, for instance, with occasional intervals of suspension, served at St. Anne Blackfriars, for over thirty years post-1583,[4] while William Cooper, perhaps the preacher

---

1. Knappen, op.cit. 267.
2. See Chapter XI, sub. The Battle Joined, for the details.
3. Nos. XXXVI, LVI. (Card. Synod, i, 267,278). The number of obligatory administrations was reduced from the four a year laid down by Aylmer in 1583 to two in Bancroft's 1598 visitation, and remained thus in the 1604 canons.
4. He was suspended for a time in 1584 (DNB.), 1591-94 when he was in prison for nonconformity (DNB.), and 1604 (Two Elizabethan Diaries, ed. M.M.Knappen, American Society of Church History (Chicago 1933)), 31. It is unlikely that he became, as the DNB. states, minister of St. Anne Blackfriars in 1598. (cf. Appendix B).

favourable[1] mentioned in Marprelate's "Just Censure and Reproofe", was employed for a decade by the parishioners of St. Alphage. George Phillips,[2] Humphrey Wildblood,[3] and Eusebius Paget,[4] all prominent Puritans, likewise read lectures in London for some time during the 1590s, as did Anthony Wootton[5] and, possibly, Henry Jacob,[6] The more intransigent of them - Wildblood and Jacob - did not long survive,[7] but the others were less disturbed perhaps because of the patronage they enjoyed,[8] or the less strenuous rule of Aylmer's later years and that of his immediate successor, Richard Fletcher, or - certainly in the

---

1. The Marprelate Tracts, 1588, 1589, ed. W. Pierce (1911), 356. Marprelate refers to 'Cooper of Paul's Chain'; this was in the parish of St. Augustine (not St. Gregory, as Pierce assumes in his biographical note (p.356), and we know from the 1589 Lib. Vis. that Cooper (christian name not given) was preacher there at this time (GLMS. 9537/7, f.104r.). He had left there before 1592, and in 1590 a William Cooper was appointed preacher at St. Alphage (GLMS. 1432/3 [no fol.]) Quite possibly, he was the same man.
2. At St. Edmund Lombard St. 1590 (GLMS. 9234/2, f.112r.). For his writings see DNB.
3. At Holy Trinity Minories, 1589-1590 (GLMS. 9537/7, f.114r.); Parish Register, baptisms July 12th, 1590 (GLMS. 9238 [no fol.].
4. At St. Botolph Aldgate 1598-1600 (here) (GLMS. 9234/7, f.135
5. At All Hallows Barking 1598-1626 (DNB).
6. A Jacob (no Christian name) was inhibited from his position as preacher at St. Augustine in August 1597 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, f.161v.). It is known that Henry Jacob had returned from his banishment in Holland, and was in London in 1597. (DNB).
7. Wildblood was sequestered from his Redbourne (Herts.) vicarage in 1591 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.39v.), and presumably lost his Minories position at the same time.
8. Egerton had a powerful patron in the '90s in the person of the Earl of Essex (HMC. Hatfield MSS.xi, 154).

case of Paget[1] - because they were prepared to compromise to an extent John Field would hardly have admitted.

Despite these survivors, the group of unattached parish lecturers who flourished in London post-1589 contained a smaller proportion of radicals than its immediate predecessor of the 1580-89 period.[2] Disinclination to accept a benefice on the terms imposed by the Anglican authorities was no longer a dominant characteristic of these preachers. Some of them - Christopher Threlkeld,[3] William Brook[4] - made a lectureship their stepping-stone to the cure of souls of the same parish, while others appeared to prefer to preach twice weekly in two or three different parishes than to undertake pastoral duties. Nicholas Alsop, who more than anyone exploited his popularity

---

1. For example of Paget participating in communion services at St. Botolph Aldgate, see GLMS. 9234/5, f.240r. Twenty years earlier, Paget had been in danger of losing a similar lecturing position because of his resistance to this regulation (CUL. MS. Mm,1,43,23,p.446). A stronger indication of his gradual metamorphosis was his collation to the rectory of St. Anne and St. Agnes in 1604 (Henn. 95).
2. In 1583, 9 of 14 unattached lecturers are known to have been Puritans (Field, Barber, Paget, Cheston, Crooke, Edmunds, Anderson, Banar, Egerton).
In 1589, 6 of 11 (Anderson, Egerton, Cooper, Crooke, Phillips, Wildblood).
In 1592, 2 of 7 (Egerton, Cooper*)
in 1598, 4 of 12 (Egerton, Cooper*, Paget, Wootton).
*on the assumption that he was the ex-Paul's Chain preacher
3. Lecturer at St. Botolph Aldgate 1587-94; P C. here. 1594-[illegible] (d). (GLMS. 9234/2-7, passim.).
4. Lecturer at St. Olave Jewry 1592 (GLMS. 9537/8, f.81r.); vicar ibm. 1593 (Henn. 357).

as a preacher, was employed in three different parishes in 1598 besides giving casual sermons elsewhere;[1] his total income, untaxed, approached £50.

This analysis necessitates a caveat against an over-simplification of the component parts that made up the parish lecturer. Heylyn, his views moulded by the London lecturer of 1640, saw in the emergence of the parish lecturer the "new fashions of Geneva", a Puritan creation immune from ecclesiastical control and exploited for sectarian ends.[2] The failure of authority to regulate their activities was, in his opinion, responsible for "...most of the mischiefs which have thence ensued...". Heylyn's view of the status of a lecturer has been widely followed, and may be summed up in Knappen's definition:[3] "Lecturers were men without official rank in the church who were employed by the Puritans to deliver sermons in addition to those, if any, of the ordinary clergyman". This interpretation, as we have seen, is quite incomplete for the London lecturer of the Elizabethan period. Not only did Heylyn post-date the emergence of the class by forty years,[4] and ignore the efforts of Aylmer, Whitgift, and Bancroft to regulate the

---

1. St. Antholin, St. Martin Ludgate, St. Mary Woolnoth.
2. Heylyn, op.cit. 9.
3. Two Puritan Diaries, 20.
4. "Lectures...were not raised upon this foundation [1559], but were brought in afterwards, borrowed by Travers and the rest, towards the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, from the new fashions of Geneva..." (op.cit.9).

activities of the unattached lecturers, but he exaggerated both the Puritan element and the immunity they enjoyed. The lecturer was often a beneficed clergyman or curate, either in the same parish or elsewhere in the city, and was subject to ecclesiastical control by virtue of the latter position. Of the 'unattached' lecturers, far from all were Puritans, and the strength of the Puritan nucleus that existed in 1566 and in the 1580s, was dissipated by the disciplinary measures taken against individual members. The tension that later developed between the class of lecturers and the beneficed ranks was less apparent in the Elizabethan period when so many of the London clergy belonged to both classes, nor is there any substantial evidence of a division of loyalty among parishioners between their incumbent and their lecturer when both may have been the same person, and, if not, when the latter was rarely appointed without the approval of the former. Only to a very limited extent were lecturers the "bane of monarchy" in the time of Elizabeth.[1]

(iii) CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

(a) TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

Fairly typical were the arrangements made at St. Christophe le Stocksin 1577. At a vestry held on January 20, 1577 in the presence of Alderman Wolstan Dixie, "Request was maid that ther

---

1. This allegation was made in [Anon], Les Talionis (1649), 9; quoted by Hill, 344.

might be some learned man apoynted to Read a lecter in this parishe twise a weke and for the mayntenance thereof A collection shuld be made of the benevolence of the parishioners to thentent it might be knowen what the some wold Amount vnto".[1] A church warden and a sidesman were appointed to "...travall with the parishioners and to sett downe in writting what everymen is willing of his owen benevolence to geve yerly towards the same". Evidently the response was favourable, for at the following vestry the church wardens, along with Nicholas Fuller, a prominent Puritan lawyer, who was a parishioner, were instructed to "...take care to apoynt some learned man for the readinge of a lecture from mychelmas next to Ester following and to bestowe vpon the said lecturer as to them shalbe thought convenyent."[2]

We may note the important part played by the parish vestry in the establishment of a lecture. The incumbent was not present, and the decision appears to have been made independently of his views, though his permission would be needed if an 'outside' preacher intended to use his pulpit.[3] The actual

---

1. Parish of St. Christopher-le-Stocks and Unpublished Records of the City of London, ed. E.Freshfield, (privately printed, 1886), 7.
2. Ibid. 8.
3. cf. GLMS. 1568, p.378 where a declaration in writing was made by the rector and church wardens agreeing to the appointment of an outsider in 1599. At St. Margaret Lothbury, the rector in 1592 gave up the lecture and formally gave leave "...for another to Reed or preache any daie or daies that they woulde apoynt..." (GLMS. 4352/1, f.65v.)

choice of lecturer was left to the wardens and the most influential of the parishioners, and gave to these men an enviable source of patronage. The delegation of this vital authority by the vestry to a small group was not universally popular, and a more democratic practice existed in some of the parishes. At St. Botolph Aldgate, candidates preached 'trial' sermons before a decision was made by the vestry as a whole,[1] while at St. Margaret New Fish Street, where there were two applicants for the post in 1582, the issue was decided by vote.[2] Although the vestry was a select one, this method of appointment came nearest to a direct form of congregational election, and must have compensated to some extent for the parishioners' lack of voice in the appointment of their incumbent.[3] The variety in the method of appointment that existed between parishes may have been due to the dominating influence of a single person

---

1. GLMS. 9234/6, f.97r. cf. St. Olave Southwark 1607, where each of the four contenders was "...to take a text gyven them by [the Rector] and to preache once...before their electyon." (VM. 1604-1724, f.8r.)
2. GLMS. 1175/1, [no fol.]. The successful candidate (by 17 votes to 3) was Thomas Edmunds, still at this date a member of the London classis.
3. In 1583 it was decided that only those who had borne office in the parish "...or otherwise thought meete" were qualified to to attend vestries, but it is clear from the consistency in numbers in previous vestries, and from efforts made to fine absentees, that some kind of select vestry existed before 1578 (the first date of the surviving VM.) For a discussion of the growth of select vestries see Sidney and Beatrice Webb, English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporatio Act, (1924), i,37-40.

at some vestries,[1] or, more often, to the value of the lectureship in question. A parish that offered a stipend of £20-£30 would not need to advertise for candidates, particularly in the later part of the reign when the number of available *ministers* in London tended to be greater than the demand for them.[2] No less than six preachers applied for the lucrative post of St. Botolph Aldgate in 1596,[3] and on other occasions preachers, hearing - accurately or otherwise - of an imminent vacancy at this parish, hastened to stake their claim for a reversionary grant by preaching 'voluntary' sermons at the church.[4] The market of young lecturers, according to Bishop Earle, was Paul's Walk, "...[where] you may cheapen[them] at all rates and sizes."[5]

Candidates for a prized lectureship found it useful to appear with a testimonial from an influential citizen or prominent preacher. At Christ Church, where the parishioners in 1581 converted an endowment by St. Bartholomew's Hospital for the maintenance of singing men in the quire, into a fund to

---

1. At St. Botolph Aldgate, the ultimate decision appears to have rested with the Queen's farmer of the rectory, who was a parishioner (e.g. GLMS. 9234/1, f.135r.). Heaton, at St. Andrew Holborn, was selected by a warden, with the consent of the 'best parishioners' (GLMS. 4249, f.235v.)
2. See Chapter IX, pp.456-7
3. The position was worth £30 p.a. (GLMS. 9234/6, f.97r.).
4. e.g. GLMS. 9234/2 [3rd. fol. section], f.134v.; GLMS. 9234/5, f.129r.).
5. Microcosmography (1628); quoted by W.S.Simpson, Chapters In the History of Old S. Paul's (1881), 242.

employ four preachers, the successful candidature of Francis Scarlet for one of these places in 1583 was doubtless partly due to the commendations of Anthony Cage and the Puritan divine, Thomas Crooke,[1] A letter from Nicholas Fuller secured a place for a later applicant,[2] but another, appearing in 1590 with a letter from the archbishop of Canterbury, still found it necessary to win a majority vote of "the moste and beste of parishioners hands", at a vestry.[3] Testimonials from the bishop of Norwich and a trial sermon by the candidate were sufficient to secure the preaching post at St. Botolph Aldgate for Christopher Threlkeld.[4]

Some parishes thought it prudent to obtain the approval of the bishop or archdeacon before they employed a lecturer. The governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital sought the advice of Aylmer and Mullins before accepting the candidature of William Wells to a Christ Church readership,[5] while at St. Mary Aldermanbury in 1587 a proviso made necessary the bishop's prior consent to the establishment of a lecture at all.[6] These may have been special cases due to episcopal disapproval of earlier choices, for there was nothing in existing church law

---

1. St. Barts. Hospital, Ha.1/2, f.229r.
2. Ibid., Ha.1/3, f.43v.
3. Ibid. f.53v.
4. GLMS. 9234/1, f.135r. [2nd. fol.section].
5. St. Bart. Hospital, Ha.1/2, f.230v.
6. GLMS. 3570/1, f.20v.

that made such episcopal sanction obligatory so long as the preacher remained conformable and possessed the requisite instruments. Aylmer himself, we know, was a strong advocate of the lecture system, and had enthusiastically supported the privy council plan in 1581 for weekday lectures in city wards.[1]

A suitable preacher having been approached, - the emphasis constantly was on a 'learned man',[2] almost invariably with a university degree, with the occasional additional stipulation that he be resident and unmarried[3] -, negotiations were commenced on the length of his tenure, the period of mutual 'notice', the details of his service, and his stipendiary reward. Appointment were generally made on an annual basis, and renewed accordingly; sometimes they covered a shorter period, the winter or the nine months of the year that excluded the summer when enthusiasm both for delivery and hearing sermons in London was at its

---

1. Infra, pp.428 30 A letter from Aylmer to Walsingham, March 11th, 1583, dealing with some trouble between an incumbent and a lecturer, indicates the bishop's preference for lecturers to serve "...in such parishes as have no preachers". This was a practical attitude, intended both to widen the distribution of preachers, and to avoid clashes between beneficed men and outside lecturers. (Egerton MS. 1693, f.103r.).
2. e.g. VM. St. Christopher le Stocks, 7. Only if he were the incumbent of the living, did a non-graduate hold much prospect of obtaining a lectureship post-1570 e.g. Wager (St. Benet Gracechurch), Th. Leigh (St. Botolph Aldersgate). The Puritan, George Cheston, was a rare exception.
3. At St. Olave Southwark, Daniel Rogers was bound to residence in so far as it did not endanger his Cambridge fellowship with regard to the statute governing residence. (VM. 1604-1724, f.5r.)

lowest ebb. William Ashbold, lecturer at St. Dunstan in East, in 1572, was allowed the month of July "to go to Cambrydge to the comensement and other his neadfull affaires..." The ad hoc basis of appointments was a precaution both on behalf of the parish which usually depended on the fluctuating annual contributions by parishioners to maintain the lecture, and on behalf of the preacher whose lecturing status was often no more than a temporary phase whilst awaiting preferment.

The insertion of a 'notice' clause in the contract made on entry was a more precise method of mutual insurance. Not all vestries took this precaution; where it did occur the period was usually three, occasionally six months.[2] Without this safeguard, the livelihood of a lecturer in an unendowed post lay entirely at the disposal of the whims of parishioners. Nor were vestries slow to assert their authority on occasion. At St. Lawrence Jewry a dispute between the vicar and vestry over the right to appoint the parish clerk in 1590, led the parish to suspend contributions to his lectures.[3] Two months later he yielded; it was doubtless easier to forego such a claim than to lose £13.6.8d. a year. The parishioners of St. Margaret Lothbur in 1589, badly treated by the last rector, vented their anti-

---

1. GLMS. 4887, p.197.
2. e.g. St. Dunstan in East 1578 (6 months) (GLMS. 4887, p.225) Christ Church 1571 (3 months) (St. Barts. Hosp. Ha.1/2, f.72v.)
3. GLMS. 2590/1, p.89.

clerical feeling on his successor by abandoning contributions to a lecture that had been in continuous existence for almost twenty years.[1] Dissatisfaction with the curate of St. Botolph Aldersgate led to his being "...dichardged the Reading of the Lectour".[2] A long tradition of arbitrary behaviour towards the parish lecturer existed at Christ Church where unimpeachable standards were demanded by the parishioners. The reader in 1571 was dismissed "...for lack of attendans ther and also for that [he] in his teachinge Doth not edyfie the people."[3] Two of his successors in 1583, when the parish boasted four preachers were alleged to be "...not learned, nor pleaseth the Audytorye which will be the cause that the Auditorye wyll decaye if that there by not better learned men placed".[4] An investigation of these complaints was made by the vestry, and one of the lecturers was eventually reprieved, as no more substantial grounds for his removal were given than that his "...voyce is Lowe".[5] Proposals were made in 1591 to disband the four lectureships and merge the funds to provide a preaching position

---

1. GLMS. 4352/1, f.59r. A postscript read that "...yf itt please Mr. Wells [Rector] to read the Lector upon the good hoap he hathe of the parrishes good consideration he may do as god shall move hime". Wells evidently took the risk, for three months later parochial contributions were renewed. (f.69r.).
2. GLMS. 1454, No.81. cf. GLMS. 9234/2, [3rd. fol. section]f.11C
3. St. Bart. Hospital, Ha.1/2, f.72v. The right of appointment and dismissal lay with the governors of the hospital who, seldom, however, registed parochial complaints.
4. Ibid. 229r.
5. Ibid. f.230v.

in the parish for the well-known divine Richard Greenham, who had in that year moved to London from his living in Dry Drayton, Cambridgeshire.[1] Although he did become a preacher at Christ Church, nothing came of this suggestion, probably because of the legal obstacles against appropriating the endowment for this purpose; The insecurity of the lecturers was finally exposed in 1595 when all four were dismissed by the High Commission and replaced by singing priests according to the original intent of the foundation.[2]

(b) FUNCTIONS

The range of the lecturers' duties was laid down in the agreement made on his appointment, but was often subject to change either during the course of the first year or on its renewal.[3] The number of lectures delivered weekly, varied considerably from parish to parish, and must have depended as well on the zeal as the financial capacity of parishioners. At St. Antholin, the prototype of the Protestant lectureship, three ministers preached in turn on all six weekdays,[4] while it is

---

1. Ibid. Ha.1/3, f.186r.
2. Ibid, f.144v., where a copy of the order is preserved. Signed by Lord Keeper, Bishops of London, Rochester, Winchester, and other Ecclesiastical Commissioners, it stated that the hospital authorities were "...forthwith...to fynde fyve mynisters which shall have knowledge in the scyence of prycksong to singe and celebrate devyne service accordinge to the foundacon of our late Lorde kinge Henry the eight."
3. e.g. at St.Dunstan in East, Ashbold lectured for 11 months a year at a £30 salary 1572-78, when the terms were altered to £20 for 9 months preaching, and summer sermons "...if he be in towne". (GLMS. 4887, p.225).
4. Dorothy Williams, loc.cit. 4.

known that Thomas Barber was preaching four days a week in the early 1580s at St. Mary le Bow.[1] The average parish lecturer, however, was less arduously committed, his duties varying from one to three sermons a week.[2] At St. Margaret Lothbury a lecture was originally delivered on two weekday afternoons; in 1585 the parishioners decided on a Sunday morning lecture and one in mid-week, and some years later the latter was abandoned.[3] Duncan Anderson, the Scot attached to St. Botolph Aldgate in 1583, delivered lectures every Thursday afternoon and Sunday morning as well as catechising after evening prayer.[4] This latter duty was entrusted to the lecturer rather than the curate, probably because the vestry preferred the former's treatment of the exercise. Instead of confining himself to an interrogation of the scriptural knowledge of the youths and servants who belonged to the church, Anderson expounded on a text before a congregation composed both of adults and

---

1. SP. ii,220.
2. e.g. St. Lawrence Jewry three days a week post-1565 (GLMS. 2590/1, passim); St. Helen's Bishopsgate two a week in 1576. (The Annals of St. Helen's Bishopsgate, London, ed. J.E.Cox,(1876), 106); St. Margaret New Fish St. once weekly post-1582 (GLMS. 1175/1 [no fol.]). Each lecture was generally stipulated to last an hour.
3. GLMS. 4352/1, ff.30v.,80r.
4. GLMS. 9234/1, passim. Catechism of the youth was also part of Heaton's duties at St. Andrew Holborn (GLMS. 4249, f.235v.). cf. Stephen Gosson's duties at Stepney (Memorials of Stepney Parish, ed. G.W.Hill and W.H.Frere (Guildford 1890-1), 10.

adolescents.[1] A catechising service in his hands was in fact a synonym for another sermon or lecture, a practice which met with the approval less of the ecclesiastical authorities than of the parishioners.[2]

Lectures elsewhere were often confined to certain weekdays, particularly if the appointed preacher was other than the incumbent. One London parson who decided to give up the reading of the parish lectures himself, gave leave "...for another to Reed or preache any daie or daies that they woulde apoynt, Resarving dondie to himselfe."[3] In some parishes where the incumbent lectured, the choice of day was left to him; in others a difference of opinion caused some tension between parson and vestry.[4] At St. Lawrence Jewry a compromise was arranged in 1581 by holding lectures for six months on Friday evenings and Sunday mornings, and inverting the procedure for the remainder of the year.[5] Early morning lectures were an institution at St. Antholin parish, but were not universally popular; the volume of payments in later Elizabethan parish

---

1. His successor was similarly instructed to "...Cattechyse to the edifyenge of the people Both yonge and owlde". (GLMS.9234/1, f.135r.)
2. His successor, Christopher Threlkeld, was admonished (probably by the bishop) to catechise children, apprentices and servants in 1592 (GLMS. 9234/2,[3rd. fol.section],f.97r.). Nearly forty years later, Bishop Laud in his instructions concerning lecturers, ordered that all Sunday afternoon sermons be turned into catechising by question and answer (D.Neal, The History of the Puritans (1822), ii, 170).
3. GLMS. 4352/1, f.65v.
4. e.g. St. Bartholomew Exchange 1602 (Freshfield, op.cit.47).
5. GLMS. 2590/1, p.67.

account books for the purchase of candles for the lectures reflected the growing practice of holding them in the late afternoon or evening.[1]

In practice a parish lecturer's activities ranged far wider than was apparent in the terms of his appointment. After 1580 he was committed by order of the privy council to participate periodically in the administration of the Holy Communion in the church where he preached. This was a disciplinary measure directed, as we have seen, against nonconformist preaches who declined to perform any other ministerial function; more conformable unbeneficed lecturers were less reluctant to take part in parochial affairs. Christopher Threlkeld, the lecturer at St. Botolph Aldgate from 1587 until his donation to the curacy in 1594, on several occasions assisted Robert Heaz, the minister, at the busy Easter communions, or took his place, on his illness or absence, at a Sunday service, or at a marriage, baptism, or funeral.[2] As Heaz was a non-preacher, Threlkeld was often called upon to preach the statutory quarterly sermons,[3] while he secured a virtual monopoly of the sermons delivered on the burial of parishioners; indeed, he preached almost as many funeral or commemorative sermons as lectures during his years in the

---

1. See CWA. in general.
2. e.g. GLMS. 9234/2, [2nd. fol.section], ff.24v.,34v.,42v.
3. These were made at the appointment, and cost of the farmer of the impropriate rectory (GLMS. 9234/2 [2nd.section], f.11r.).

parish.[1]

A reputation could quickly be established in these circumstances. In the case of Threlkeld, and that of Eusebius Paget, a successor at St. Botolph, preaching engagements in other City churches were frequent, sometimes on an exchange basis with the preacher of the parish visited.[2] Lecturers were committed to appoint a deputy to preach in their absence "... for that the people shulde not be disapoynted",[3] though at St. Botolph it was often left to the curate or leading parishioners. to arrange for a substitute.[4] This form of lecturing by proxy provided less fortunate itinerant preachers with occasional employment, but was unpopular both with the parish and with the ecclesiastical authorities, for it was a possible loophole for an unlicensed preacher to find a pulpit. David Dee and Thomas Gattacre, lecturers at Christ Church parish in 1586, were censured in the episcopal visitation for allowing substitutes to use their pulpits,[5] while the vestry of St. Botolph Aldgate in 1599 only cured Eusebius Paget's habit of persistently placing his young son Ephraim to preach in that parish while he himself performed elsewhere, by a thinly veiled threat of

---

1. Only infrequently did a person specify a preacher to deliver his funeral sermons; usually the choice was left to his executors, who normally appointed the lecturer if resident and available.
2. Ibid. f.118v.
3. GLMS. 9234/1, f.135r.
4. Ibid. [2nd.section], f.34r.
5. GLMS. 9537/6, ff.110r, 117r.

dismissal.[1]

A non-beneficed lecturer who resided in the parish where he preached, and who took an active part in parochial affairs, was a man of considerable influence, and a potential rival to the incumbent of the living, particularly if the latter belonged to the less gifted class of 'dumb' ministers. All the glamour and prestige attached by contemporaries to the sermon lay with the lecturer; his monopoly of the pulpit put him in a position of immense power with his congregation. Parishioners, by diverting the tithes they owed to their parson to maintain an 'outside' preacher, and by observing various forms of boycott, could seriously jeopardise the security of the incumbent's livelihood. The ingredients of the rift which, we are told, split the London ministry of the Laudian era into the two factions of beneficed clergy and unattached lectures,[2] already existed in the age of Aylmer. Oblique indications of resentment on the part of the beneficed ranks are first found in 1580-81, flourishing years for the unattached preacher, and were expressed in the protests included in the petition to Convocation against "...privatt readinge in howses..."; the disturbing influence of merchants returning home "...contemptuouse and rebelling against our state ecclesiasticall", from the public lectures at Antwerp

---

1. GLMS. 9234/5, f.222v. The ultimatum appears to have been made under the pressure of the bishop.
2. e.g. [Anon.] Persecutio Undecima (1648), 10-11 (quoted by Hill, 275.).

and elsewhere; and the diversion of parishioners' legacies from charitable purposes to the maintenance of "straunge preacher[s]"[1] Aylmer, characteristically sensitive to clerical grievances, urged in his general visitation of 1580 that lecturers should confine their activities to parishes which had non-preaching incumbents.[2] Yet actual instances of triangular disputes between parson, parishioners and unattached preacher were, despite the colourful language of the 1581 petition, a rarity, and in most cases could be ascribed to lay discontent with the preaching deficiencies of their incumbent.[3] Graver portents of differences issuing from more positive sectarian sources were evident in the reluctance of the (preaching) rector of St. Mary le Bow to re-admit Thomas Barber "...a depravour of the ministers",[4] as lecturer in his parish, and in the complaints made at Bancroft's visitation of 1598 by beneficed ministers

---

1. Bodl. MS. Wood, F30-2, p.86-7.
2. Aylmer to Walsingham, March 11th 1583, "In my visitacon I made god wylling to ordre that no man shall meddle in a nother man's Cure where there is a preacher for yt bredyth many inconveniences." (Egerton MS. 1693, f.103r.).
3. e.g. SP.ii,227, cf. the complaints against Eusebius Paget, a London lecturer, by "...a bare readinge minister, whereby great troble is lyke to ensue" (J.Field to A.Gilby, February 28th, 1581, CUL. MS.Mm,1,43,33, p.446).
4. Egerton MS. 1693, f.103r. Although the incumbent is not named, the fact that he was a preacher, a nominee of the archbishop, and that Barber was for years a lecturer at St. Mary le Bow (SP. ii,220) puts it beyond doubt that he was Thomas Ware, rector 1577-1583 (Henn. 307). His attempt to remove Barber was unsuccessful, despite Aylmer's sympathy, for not until 1584 was the lecturer suspended. (SP.ii,219).

about Stephen Egerton's magnetic preaching, which drew citizens away from their own churches to the Blackfriars.[1] Such precursors of the bitter quarrels of the Laudian era were, however, exceptional, and their very rarity suggests that the problem of relationship was yet to present itself in an acute form in London.

As already suggested, the explanation lay largely in the fluidity that existed between the two classes, when lecturers often held livings elsewhere, or took up preaching posts in anticipation of preferment. There were few permanent parochial endowments to provide the necessary security for an unbeneficed preacher. Moreover, his influence in the pulpit over his congregation did not extend to the vestry room or to the sphere of parochial administration. Rarely did he sit around the vestry table, where a place - often the chair - was automatically kept for the incumbent,[2] nor was he a party to the parish committee which exerted considerable disciplinary power by its exclusive right to draw up the quarterly bills of presentment.[3] His signature was not to be found as a witness to the last testament of parishioners.[4] On the whole, the position of a

---

1. HMC. Hatfield MSS, xi, 154.
2. Only once did Duncan Anderson, lecturer at St. Botolph Aldgate 1583-86, attend a vestry meeting. (GLMS. 9234/1, f.25v.).
3. Bills were prepared by the incumbent (or curate), church wardens and sidesmen.
4. It must be said that the clerical body was rapidly losing its long established claim to write the wills of parishioners to the professional scrivener (see the complaint made in the 1581 petition, Bodl. MS. Wood, F30-2, p.87).

lecturer was regarded as complementary to, not competitive with, that of the incumbent, an assistant not a rival. The vestrymen of St. Botolph Aldgate in 1597 were "...fully determyned to have both a lectorer and a [preaching] Curatt, for that it was thought that one man cannot well suplye the place both of lectorer and Curatt."[1]

(c) MAINTENANCE

As far as can be ascertained, only the lectures at St. Antholin and St. Michael Paternoster Row (Whittington College) were already endowed, the one by funds from property, the other by a legacy in the trust of the Clothworkers Company, before the Elizabethan period.[2] According to the reports of the Charity Commissioners,[3] very few endowments were made for this purpose during the next forty years, and the handful that was founded, mostly helped to maintain lectureships already in existence by virtue of parochial contributions. At St. Antholin a small bequest was made by Lady Elizabeth Martin in 1581 for the preachers that read every morning in the parish;[4] more substantial was the £100 left to the parish by William Garret, citizen and merchant taylor, the interest on which was to be

---

1. GLMS. 9234/6, f.97v.
2. The stipend was £10 p.a. (term-time lectures only), (Lansd. MS. 19,72.).
3. Endowed Charities (County of London) (1897), passim.
4. Ibid. 449.

employed towards the maintenance of the morning lecture.[1] Garret, who appears to have been much influenced by the sermons of John Field,[2] left a similar sum for a lecture at St. Mary Aldermary where he was a parishioner.[3] This legacy was certainly received by the church wardens, and was for several years lent out at a 5% interest which was annually paid to the minister from the parish funds. The £5 supplemented a previous bequest of an annual rent-charge of £4 for the same purpose by John Rowe in 1582, but it is clear from the church account books that the lecturer had still to be heavily subsidised by an annual grant from the parish stock.[4]

At St. Michael Paternoster Row a companion lectureship to that established in 1508 was endowed by John Heydon, a mercer.[5] By his will, dated in 1579, his executors were

---

1. Somerset House, PCC.59 Windsor. This legacy is not included in the Commissioners' report, although it is known to have been received by the parish. A number of other bequests to the St. Antholin lectures, made before 1603, and likewise unrecorded by the Charity Commissioners, are listed in the CWA. (GLMS. 1046/1, f.79r.). The interest in 1603 from individual legacies amounted to £15.5.0, only half the sum required to cover the £30 salary paid to the three lecturers. The rest was partially made up by the interest accrued on parochial contributions. It is worth nothing that even the most heavily endowed of all Elizabethan lectureships was to some extent dependent on parochial benevolence.
2. Field was left £10 in his will.
3. Endowed Charities, vi, 440.
4. Ibid, vi, 440. In 1598-9, £9 of the £20 p.a. salary paid to the lecturer came from bequests, the remainder from the parish. (cf. GLMS. 6574, ff.iv.-10r., passim).
5. Ibid. vi, 548.

directed to pay £300 upon trust to the Company of Mercers who were, inter alia, to bestow £13.6.8d, to maintain yearly for ever a weekly divinity lecture in the church. The preacher was to be appointed by those who elected the reader of the Cloth-workers' lecture in the same church.[1]

One of a number of charitable bequests made by Sir Wolstan Dixie, a former Lord Mayor of London, who died in 1593, was to bestow a £10 annuity to the Skinners' Company to be employed to maintain a bi-weekly lecture in a City church, preferably St. Michael Bassishaw where he was a parishioner.[2] There appears to have been a considerably delay in the execution of the legacy, for not until 1600 did the executors determine the venue of the lecture. No provision was made of the method of the preacher's appointment, an omission that had its repercussions over two centuries later when the vestry claimed the right to appoint an outsider to the exclusion of the rector.[3] A bequest made by Thomas Cater in 1590 to endow a lecture in the parish of St. Bartholomew Exchange provoked another lengthy dispute on somewhat different grounds; the executor showed extreme reluctance to dispose unconditionally of the £50 in question,

---

1. According to Thomas Sampson, who held the position for a time, the Clothworkers' Company "...have the Nominacon of the Reader, but the Archbishop of Canterbury hath the allowing of him." Parker rejected the nomination of Edward Dering in 1575. (Lansd.MS. 19-72).
2. Endowed Charities, vi, 523.
3. Ibid, vi, 523.

and not until he was threatened by proceedings in the Court of Audience did he submit to an independent arbitration and accept its judgement. The legacy was finally put into operation sixteen years after the will had been proved, and it substantially augmented a lectureship that already existed by virtue of parochial contributions and by two other annual bequests of £5 and twenty nobles.[1]

A forerunner of a more deliberately sectarian endowment occurred in the terms of the legacy of £100 made by Thomas Ridge, citizen and grocer, in 1598 to the parson and church wardens of St. Benet Gracechurch Street for the maintenance of a lecture in that parish.[2] The preacher was to be paid £10 a year for reading a lecture every Sunday for the space of ten years. He was to be appointed by the oversees of the will "...otherwise this gift to be voyde." This condition is made more significant by the names of the oversees, all four of whom - William Clark, Stephen Egerton, Edward Phillips and Anthony Wootton - were among the leading nonconformist preachers of the day. This attempt to provide a pulpit for a Puritan protégé did not in fact prove successful, for, although the first occupant may very possibly have been at that time a

---

1. None of these legacies were recorded by the Charity Commissioners. For the relevant information see Freshfield, op.cit, 33-58 passim.
2. Somerset House, PCC.1,2,Kidd (probate January 17th, 1599).

fellow traveller,[1] within two years the position was held by the subscribing rector of the benefice.[2]

Endowments for the maintenance of parish lectures became more fashionable in the Jacobean age; citizens of substantial means frequently found in such a practice an opportunity both to commemorate their own piety and, by attaching conditions of residence and of academic ability, to effect an improvement in the state of the established church. The stability of a lecture that was independent of parochial contributions was much enhanced, and the increase in the number of endowments post-1600 prepared the way for a powerful class of lecturers in London, many of whom by the terms of the legacies were unattached to any benefice or curacy. Their predecessors of the Elizabethan period were more vulnerable, and, in consequence, more amenable in their relations with other clerical classes.

No more than a fragment of the Elizabethan lectures was endowed by private bequests. Nor were they sponsored by the City companies other than as trustees of a private legacy.[3] Not until

---

1. The choice of John Childersey is surprising, as he was later a chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft. His London connection (his father was a prominent turner) rather than his religious opinions may have secured the position for him. See GLMS. 1568, p.378 for the consent of the rector and C.Ws. to his appointment.
2. See the subscription lists in Lambeth Chartae Miscellaneae, xiii, 2/59, f.3r.
3. e.g. The Clothworkers' Company was trustee of the legacy made by James Finch for a lecture at Whittington College (St.Michael Paternoster Row).

1623 did the City corporation provide a grant to maintain a parish lecture,[1] a conservatism that contrasted sharply with the enterprise of provincial municipal governments such as Leicester and Ipswich,[2] but conformed with its attitude in general towards ecclesiastical affairs. In 1581 the privy council, probably on the initiative of Francis Walsingham, drew up a blue-print for bi-weekly lectures in 'every convenient division' of the City, to be financed by contributions of "... mens benevolences bothe of the Clergie and other Inhabitants of that Citie."[3] The task of converting the City government to the scheme was entrusted to a group of prominent clerics; among them was Aylmer, at that time at the height of his quarrel with the Lord Mayor over the episcopal contribution to the re-building of the gutted steeple of St. Paul's Cathedral.[4] A less propitious occasion for the embarking of the plan could hardly have been chosen, for, as we have seen, lectures already existed in over twenty City parishes. The number of such lectures

---

1. Dorothy Williams, loc.cit., 5. £40 was then provided for the maintenance of the St. Antholin lectures.
2. For the Leicester lectures, see Records of the Borough of Leicester, ed. Mary Bateson, iii, (Cambridge 1905), 1-li.) For Ipswich, cf. Ipswich Great Court Book, 1572-1643, pp.53,86 etc. (Ipswich Borough Records, Ipswich Public Library). I am indebted to Dr. P.Collinson for the latter reference.
3. LCRO. Remembrancia,i,1579-1593, f.113r., and v. Headed: Privy Council Instructions for the maintenance of preachers "... to rede lectures in such Churches in London as shalbe appointed.' The Instructions were enclosed in a letter sent by Aylmer to the Lord Mayor on August 31st. 1581.
4. Analytical Index, 322-7.

"...founded by voluntarie good affection of sondry parishes" as well as those at the Inns of Court and the cathedral, and the preachers at Christ Church, Newgate Street; the difficulties of creating such a precedent without obtaining the consent of the Court of Common Council; and the financial burdens already imposed on the City by its charitable work with orphans and exhibitions for university students, were among the arguments employed by the Lord Mayor in his letter to Aylmer opposing the scheme.[1] The bishop wrote to Burghley urging the Council to "...signifie hir Majesties pleasure..." directly to the Mayor, lest "...a good purpose shalbe overthrown by the might of Mammon,"[2] but although this was at once done,[3] there was no response from the City. A new Lord Mayor, under pressure from the council[4] and individually from Walsingham,[5] was eventually persuaded to set up a joint-committee of aldermen and common councillors to devise methods of carrying out the plan.[6] The sudden petering out of the project suggests negative conclusions on the part of the committee, although several of its members are known to have been of radical sympathies in their private

---

1. LCRO. Remembrancia,i,1579-1593, f.113v. (Sept. 6th, 1581).
2. Lansd. MS. 33,23.
3. Privy council to Lord Mayor, September 9th, 1581, LCRO. Remembrancia, f.118v; APC. xiii, 199.
4. LCRO. Remembrancia, f.139v.; APC. xiii, 307.
5. via Thomas Norton, the remembrancer of the City. Walsingham to Norton, November 8th, 1581, LCRO. Remembrancia, i, f.137r.
6. LCRO. Letter Bk. Z, f.194v. (January 25th, 1582).

capacities.[1] The failure of this scheme presents a paradox between the private enthusiasm of citizens and the indifference of their public representatives towards financing lectures.

The majority of parish lectureships had no regular form of endowment, surviving precariously from year to year on quarterly contributions by parishioners. A survey of the "goodwill" of the people was made by a church-warden or sidesman before a preacher was approached, and the terms of the appointment depended in part on the response shown.[2] Collections must cover not only the lecturer's remuneration, but also the extra payments due to the parish clerk and sexton, and the cost of candles during the evening lectures in the winter season. In most parishes, contributions were voluntary, and were confined to the benevolence of the element in favour of the practice. They were normally assessed according to the rate due for the wages of the parish clerk, and they paid quarterly to collectors who might be the wardens or even the curate of the church.[3] A precarious arrangement endured in the small parish of Holy Trinity Minories, where the salaries appear to have come mainly from funds gathered after sermons, occasionally from special donations.[4] In 1567 the Duchess of Suffolk gave

---

1. Three of the nineteen members subscribed to a petition on behalf of Barber, a suspended Puritan preacher circa 1585 (Thomas Aldersey, Andrew Palmer, Walter Fish) (SP. 11, 220).
2. e.g. GLMS. 4072/1, f.28r.
3. e.g. ibid, f.50r. where the preacher toured the parish himself.
4. Tomlinson, op.cit. 214.

10/- to the church after hearing a sermon by her protégé, Pattinson,[1] while in the following year three parishioners were singled out by the church officials "...for ther lyberallyty towardes the preachers...or else it wold a coste us more money." Occasionally, there is evidence of financial support from individuals from outside the parish - William Wager's stipend at St. Benet Gracechurch regularly came from "...sertaine of the parishioners and others,"[3] while there is one instance of a pension being made in one parish to assist in the maintenance of a lecturer in another,[4] a rare example of inter-parochial co-operation.

A few vestries ventured to impose a compulsory rate on all householders in the parish. A parish rate was an infrequently employed power, levied as an extraordinary measure to wipe out a debt or cover the cost of church repairs; defaulters could be sued or cited into an ecclesiastical court by the 'detecta' method.[5] An assessment was made by a specially appointed committee, and was generally based on the rental value of a house or on the rent-charges paid by parishioners for their pews

---

1. Ibid. 279. For Pattinson's connection with the Duchess of Suffolk see A. Peel, The First Congregational Churches (1920), 28
2. ~~Ibid. 214.~~ Tomlinson, op cit 314
3. GLMS. 1568, pp.230, 238.
4. St. Stephen Walbrook. £3.6.8d. p.a. out of the church stock was granted on March 11th, 1582 to Thomas Barber "...in consytteration of his readinge the lectures at Woolchurche." (St. Mary Woolchurch). (MS. 593/2, f.2r.).
5. e.g. GLMS. 4956/2, f.77r.

After an unsuccessful appeal for voluntary contributions in the parish of St. Bartholomew Exchange, a compulsory rate was levied according to the amount payable for the clerk's wages.[1] In Stepney, a pew-rent accounted for two-thirds of the salary paid to the preacher, while the remaining £10 was donated by the rector - the only instance we have of an incumbent subsidising the activities of an outside preacher in his own parish.[2]

Few parishes were able to maintain their lecturers wholly by parochial contributions, voluntary or compulsory. At St. Helen Bishopsgate substantial arrears were recorded annually between 1576-79,[3] although the preacher was the well-known Puritan, Thomas Barber; this may have accounted for the reduction of the salary from £13.6.8d. to £12 in 1580.[4] The 1576-7 figures illustrate the dependence of the system on the benevolence of a minority; of the £10.19.8d. collected, £7 came from five persons, while of thirty-four householders assessed, ten were in arrears of payment, seven for a year, and three for six months.[5] Rarely did the parishioners of St. Mary Woolchurch

---

1. Freshfield, op.cit. 17-18.
2. Memorial of Stepney Parish, 10-11.
3. GLMS. 6836, ff.26r.-33r.
4. Ibid. f.33v.
5. Ibid. f.26r. and v. A list of individual payments and arrea for the lecture is rare for this period. (A list of dues has been printed in the V.M.Bks. of St. Bartholomew Exchange, 17.). Generally, such lists were drawn up on separate rolls which have not survived, and the totals were sometimes (not frequently) inserted in the CWA. on their receipt by the wardens.

approach the sum of £20 paid to the lecturer, Thomas Crooke; on one occasion the collection was £6 short of the total required.[1]

Annual fluctuations in parochial contributions exacerbated the insecurity of the lecturer's position. Deficits were as far as possible covered by grants from the parish stock, but such subsidies were a heavy strain on the finances of the less wealthy churches. The vestry men of St. Helen Bishopsgate, anticipating parochial arrears, determined that deficits should be made up from the 'surplusage' collected for the clerk's wages.[2] A similar practice existed in St. Bartholomew Exchange, and probably elsewhere, but in the majority of cases recourse to the parish stock was inevitable. In consequence, church wardens were reluctant to persevere with an institution inadequately supported by the parish, and often the lecture was abandoned for a time until enthusiasm revived.

The most stable of the unendowed lectureships were probably those set up in parishes where the revenues of the living had come into the hands of the parishioners either by the purchase or lease of the impropriation or by the farm of an absentee rector's tithes. A substantial part of the revenues was often diverted to employ a preacher or pay the curate to read weekly

---

1. GLMS. 1013/1, f.53r. In 1590-1 a loan of £8.16.2d. was made from the church stock to make up the stipend. (f.62r.).
2. Cox, op.cit. 106.
3. Freshfield, op.cit. 18.

lectures, and constituted a regular wage drawn from sources that in other parishes passed directly to the spiritual or impropriate rector. Parishioners, relieved of the burden of contributing to maintain a preacher as well as paying tithes, found it easier to support a regular lectureship. Until 1587 the parishioners of St. Lawrence Jewry paid £10 to their lecturer as well as tithes amounting to about £70 to Balliol College, the appropriate rector; in that year a lease of the impropriation was purchased, and part of the funds was used to cover the preacher's stipend, which within six years was doubled. Not all such parishes, however, were in a position to abandon special contributions; the vestry men of St. Mary Aldermanbury, requested by the Lord Treasurer to provide a lecture for a newly donated curate in 1591, agreed that "...(being a matter voluntarie) they can sett downe no Certeinetie; But it is not to be doubted, but that uppon Mr. Harlands [the curate] well usinge of himselfe, and paines taking therein there wilbe collected of a number of well-disposed persons that waie a Competent yearlie some to his good Contentment...".[2]

Turning to the value of a lecturer's stipend, we might anticipate a greater generosity on the part of parishioners who controlled their own rectorial impropriations than citizens

---

1. GLMS. 2690/1, pp.92-106 passim.
2. GLMS. 3570/1, f.30r.

elsewhere. This is borne out by the fluctuations in the St. Lawrence Jewry salary where for over twenty years the preacher earned sums between £8-£10 a year for reading lectures three days a week.[1] The parish in 1587 bought a lease of the impropriation, and the salary was subsequently increased to £13.6.8d. (1591), £20 (1594), £65 (1602), and £80 (1603) before settling in 1604 at a rate of £40 a year.[2] Even if the 1602-3 figures are discounted as exceptional rewards for services not disclosed by the parish records, the £40 salary remains the highest known in contemporary London.[3] St. Stephen Coleman Street (post-1591),[4] and St. Lawrence Pountney,[5] other parishes whose vestries controlled the revenues of the living, augmented the incumbent's stipend of £10 and £14 p.a. by a lecturing salary of £10 and £20 respectively.

In the more orthodox type of benefice, £20 a year represented a substantial wage for part-time preaching duties. Thomas Crooke, lecturer in the parish of St. Mary Woolchurch, was given this sum for one weekly lecture to be read on a Monday evening;[6] his colleague at St. Margaret New Fish Street received

---

1. GLMS. 3590/1, pp.22-87 *passim*.
2. *Ibid*. pp.92 *et seq*.
3. A similar salary was given to the noted Puritan preacher, Edward Phillips, at St. Saviour's Southwark, for bi-weekly lectures. The impropriation was in the hands of the parishioners, as at St. Lawrence Jewry. (Florence Higham, *Southwark Story* (1955), 132).
4. GLMS. 4457/2, f.38v. *et seq*.
5. GLMS. 3907/1, [no fol.]
6. GLMS. 1013/1, f.62r.

only £6.13.4d. for the same duties.[1] Such contrasts were widespread and were doubtless due to the widely different range of support given for a lecture in the various parishes. William Wager received only £8 for his twice-weekly lectures at St. Bene Gracechurch in 1572,[2] while his contemporary at St. Dunstan in East, according to the Valor Ecclesiasticus the second wealthies benefice in London, was paid £30 for slightly heavier duties (he preached twice weekly and on holydays).[3] £20 p.a. was given to Matthew Heaton for preaching and catechising the youth of St. Andrew Holborn in 1584;[4] three years later a post as bi-weekly preacher and Sunday afternoon catechiser was vested with a salary of £30 at St. Botolph Aldgate.[5] This in 1596 appears to have been among the most prized positions in London, and was only filled after much competition by six applicants, all of whom preached trial sermons in the parish.[6] When it is considered that William Harrison considered £30 p.a. a living wage for a beneficed clergyman,[7] some appreciation of the attractiveness of these lecturing posts, often held in plurality or as an adjunct to a cure of souls elsewhere, can be formed.

---

1. GLMS. 1176/1, [no fol.]
2. GLMS. 1568, p.230.
3. GLMS. 4887, p.187. The benefice was valued at £60 in the Valor (VE. 1,370).
4. GLMS. 4249, f.235v.
5. GLMS. 9234/1, f.235v.
6. GLMS. 9234/6, f.97r.
7. Harrison's Description of England...ed. F.J.Furnivall (1877) 22.

In most parishes, the salary remained static during this period, unless, of course, there was a major alteration in the preacher's duties.[1] Only occasionally was a concession made to the rising cost of living; the three lecturers at St. Antholin, employed for most of the reign at salaries of £6 p.a., were given £10 each in 1602, and by 1618 the maximum figures had been increased to £16.6.0d.[2] A more regular form of augmentation existed at St. Mary Woolnoth where the salary was raised from £8 (1577), to £10 (1583), and £20 in 1595.[3] It is also probable that in this case, different preachers fetched different prices, and that the services of Nicholas Alsop at £20 a year in 1595 was regarded as a better investment than those of his immediate predecessor at £10. This may also explai why the £30 salary awarded to a young Cambridge graduate by the vestry of St. Dunstan in East in 1571 had been reduced to £16 by 1587 when the curate of the church read the lecture.[4]

In conclusion, we may recapitulate the various factors that made the establishment of the parish lectures so fashionable in Elizabethan London and so valuable to the contemporary clergyman The principal beneficiary was without doubt the incumbent who

---

1. As in St. Dunstan in East, for instance, where the stipend was reduced from £30 to £20 when the lecturer's duties were cut down from eleven to nine months of the year. (GLMS. 4887, p.225).
2. GLMS. 1046/1, ff.78r., 130r.
3. GLMS. 1002/1, ff.201r., 232r.
4. GLMS. 4887, p.247.

lectured in his own parish, for he was least dependent on the system. He could enjoy the augmentation (untaxed) it offered to his regular income without excessively suffering from its insecurities. Its financial attractions - in some types of livings so considerable as to represent a 100% rise in his income[1] - influenced his position in other indirect ways. The cry of poverty could not be used to the same extent to justify his pluralism; bi-weekly lectures virtually bound him to personal residence in the City, if not in the parish itself; detailed textual exposition in his sermon was at the least an arduous discipline and a continuous mental stimulus.[2] Greater pastoral diligence could improve clerical/lay relationships; moreover, less dependence on tithes meant less insistence on securing tithes, in itself a practical aid to parochial harmony. A curate, given the rare opportunity of a lecture, might react in a similar fashion; indeed, his usual reliance on a small stipend made any form of augmentation even more attractive than to his beneficed counterpart.[3]

Of the two classes of outsiders who enjoyed lecturing

---

1. e.g. St. Lawrence Pountney 1602: the incumbent was paid £10 stipend for serving the cure, and £14 for reading lectures. (GLMS. 3907/1, [no fol.]).
2. Some details of Eusebius Paget's lectures at St. Botolph Aldgate are available; e.g. on eight consecutive occasions he preached on the texts Matthew 27, 2-11. Altogether, he devoted twenty-four hourly lectures to this chapter in a little over a year. (GLMS. 9234/5, passim.).
3. See Chapter IX, pp. 449-51

positions, the first, the preacher who held a living or curacy elsewhere, found them valuable mainly as a lucrative addition to his normal income, or, particularly pre-1566, as a platform for the dissemination of radical propaganda. The second class, the purest type of lecturer in that he held no official ecclesiastical promotion, stood to gain and lose most from the institution. To the young graduate of ability, a lectureship provided a temporary position, - more valuable than the alternatives, a teaching post or curacy -, in London, an opportunity to win contacts, gain patrons, and, above all, to establish a reputation for himself.[1] A less aspiring preacher, popular with citizens, such as Nicholas Alsop or Edward Beck, could make a comfortable semi-permanent living from holding two or three such posts at the same time. To the unbeneficed nonconformist, a parish lecture provided the only link with the established church, the only opportunity to work for reform from a position within the parochial organisation. Between the mid-1570s and 1586 lectureships formed the principal public platform

---

1. The attraction of the London lectureships is well illustrated by the experience of John Smith. An Oxford student who, unable to maintain himself to pursue his studies, he determined to go to London, "...hoping here to have settled in a lectur of 40 or 50li., and thereby to have furnished my self with books that I might after a year returne to Oxforde..." His was a highly ambitious price, as we have seen; in any case, he fell foul of Aylmer, and "...therfor I feare me must be constrayned to looke into the countrye". (C.C.C.Oxon. 318, f.143v. [c.1588] I am indebted to Dr. P. Collinson for this reference.

of the London classical group. All types of unattached preacher however, suffered from the instability inherent in the institution; no tenurial safeguard was possible against, on the one hand, the intervention of ecclesiastical authority (post-1580), and, on the other, the whims of parishioners who financed them. Few lectureships, even those endowed by private legacies, were completely independent of parochial contributions, a source that fluctuated from year to year, and relied on an enthusiasm that rarely endured. A po erful class of unbeneficed lecturers could emerge only when their positions were safeguarded by permanent endowments; until that occurred there was no likelihood of the potential class conflict that lay between the ranks of the beneficed clergy and of the unattached preachers, being fully realised.

CHAPTER NINE

THE ASSISTANT CURATE.

Contemporary critics did not spare the unbeneficed minister, the assistant curates, who "...wanting places...do dailie goe, from towne to towne, from Churche to Church to see what parsons have wanted Curates to serve them."[1] Such behaviour, according to a 1584 report, bred "...a sclaunder and contempt to their calling, and [they] are made a common pointing and jesting stocke to the scornefull adversarie of religion and Atheist."[2] The verdict of a recent student echoes that of sixteenth century observers; curates, writes Mr. Brinkworth, were "...often half-literate, ill-paid hirelings constantly on the move from place to place."[3] How typical of his generation was the London curate' His tenural disabilities were no less acute in the capital than elsewhere, but some compensation was forthcoming in the opportunities for clergymen that placed a premium on preaching ability and pastoral devotion.

The unbeneficed curate was principally occupied either as an assistant to a resident rector or vicar, or in serving the cure in the place of a non-resident parson. Only a minority of resident incumbents were in a position to employ an assistant

---

1. SP. i, 131.
2. Ibid. 266.
3. The Archdeacon's Court: Liber Actorum 1584, ed. E.R. Brinkworth, ii, Oxford Rec. Soc. 24 (1942), vii.

the practice being confined to the wealthiest benefices, the most popular parishes, or those held in special circumstances. The majority of incumbents, unable to pay a regular stipend that might vary between £10-£20 for a curate, were obliged to serve the cure in person, hiring, if necessary, a temporary assistant for the Easter services. At St. Botolph Aldgate, two casual ministers helped the incumbent in dealing with 653 communicants on Easter Sunday, 1597.[1] Exceptions were those whose age, senility, or physical disability made an assistant essential,[2] and the incumbent who was also an archiepiscopal or episcopal chaplain, and who, while residing in the parish, was not able to perform the daily ministerial routine in person. Such a man was William Cotton, rector of St. Margaret New Fish Street, whose duties as examining chaplain to Aylmer, and as deputy to the archdeacon of St. Alban's, made his residence in the parish no more than intermittent. A few of the most comfortable parsons, like Thomas White at St. Dunstan in the West, could afford to employ as assistant despite their own residence;[3] such a practice was also necessary in the densely populated areas outside the City walls with "...a multitude of poor people."[4] Both Crowley and Lancelot Andrews had

---

1. GLMS. 9234/6, f.228r.
2. e.g. the blindness of Castleton, rector of St. Martin Iremonger, necessitated the services of a permanent assistant.
3. In 1561, 10 out of 41 curates were employed by resident incumbents (Mullins, 269-85).
4. Dale, 238.

assistants at St. Giles Cripplegate where there were 3,000 parishioners in the 1560s;[1] at St. Sepulchre, a 'priest',[2] as well as a curate, was employed during the declining years of the vicar, William Gravett.[3]

Pluralism, and its attribute, non-residence, however, provided the curate with his most regular source of employment.[4] As has been seen, a large number of London incumbents enjoyed two livings, either in the city, or a rural-urban combination. Both canon law and royal injunction bound the pluralist to maintain a curate in his non-resident living;[5] for the most part, there was little interference with the rector's choice, so long as the curate was equipped with appropriate instruments, but the improvement in ministerial quality by 1604 was reflected in the canon obliging a pluralist to appoint a licensed preacher unless he himself preached regularly in both his churches.[6] Such a condition would have been impossible forty years earlier.[7]

Curates probably benefited most from the activities of pluralists who held both their benefices in the capital, for

---

1. Strype, Parker, iii, 58.
2. Thus termed in the grant of a toleration (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iv, f.113r.). St. Sepulchre had a population of 3,400 in 1547 (Mullins, 46).
3. GLMS. 9537/9 [no fol.]. The rector of St. Magnus also employed two assistants in 1561. (Mullins, 279-80).
4. Chapter V, pp.216-37.
5. Card. Doc. Annals, i, 242-3.
6. Card. Synod. i, 274.
7. In the 1561 certificates, only eight assistant curates were recorded as preachers, all in their own cures - Porrage, Reniger Smyth, Norris, Coote, Wager, Grimsditch, and Brokelsby (Mullins, 269-85, passim).

very often, incumbents who held rural as well as urban cures, preferred to reside mainly in London, no doubt because of its multifarious attractions, professional no less than vocational. London pluralists, on the other hand, were obliged to maintain one curate in the capital. Often, he was switched from the one parish to the other, a convenient arrangement for a rector who wished to keep in touch with both his churches, but somewhat unsettling for the curate. Thus John Payne deputised for George Dickens alternatively at St. Alban Wood Street and St. Lawrence Jewry; Thomas Bayley was curate to John Lawnd at St. Mary Staining as well as St. Margaret Moses; George Ashbourne was employed by William Wager at both St. Benet Gracechurch and St. Michael Queenhithe.[1] Although active in two churches, a curate in this position was doubtless paid but one salary; in a sense, he was a retainer of the rector, being dependent on him both for his maintenance and employment.

To a man unable to secure regular positions, or wishing to augment his allowance, there existed numerous temporary posts in the city. The services of a minister were required during a vacancy in a living; the appointment usually lay with the bishop on granting a sequestration of the revenues, the sequestrators being instructed to apportion part of their income to the minister.[2] Generally, employment of this nature was of less

---

1. SP. ii, 180-3, passim.
2. Burn, iii, 339-40.

than six months' duration, for if the patron failed to present a successor within that period, the right fell by lapse to the bishop.[1] In the early years of the reign, patrons sometimes had difficulty in filling a poor living, and the curate might enjoy a tenancy covering several years.[2] It is possible that ministers in such positions preferred their stipendiary status, insecure as it was, to the expense of undergoing institution, and the burden of taxation borne by beneficed clergy. This would explain why Nicholas Nicholls served the cure of the £8.6.8d. benefice of St. Benet Sherehog for at least a dozen years without being instituted.[3] Richard Thomas was for many years curate in charge of the vacant vicarage of St. Stephen Coleman Street, a Crown living that was not filled until the impropriation was sold to the parishioners who promptly increase the vicarial salary.[4]

More ephemeral sources of employment were provided by the recurrent plague outbreaks, which appear to have driven many of the less devoted beneficed clergy out of the capital. Ministerial prudence in this matter was the subject of much Puritan satire.[5] At the end of the century, Thomas Earl was

---

1. Ibid, ii, 355.
2. Crown livings, where the presentation could not lapse, were particularly liable to vacancies at this time, e.g. St. Benet Sherehog, St. Nicholas Acon, St. Stephen Coleman Street.
3. There in 1564; resigned in 1576 (Appendix B.).
4. There in 1569; departed by 1580 (GLMS. 9537/4 [no fol.]).
5. cf. M.M.Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago 1939), 202.

proud to record that during forty years' incumbency, he had not been absent from the capital for more than a fortnight.[1] In the 1603 plague, even resident incumbents required the services of an assistant to deal with the sick; at St. Stephen Coleman Street the vicarial income was supplemented by the parish to meet with this emergency.[2]

Few curates were in a position to exploit the lectureship market in London. Not until 1583 did such a case occur,[3] and although the last fifteen years of the reign saw an occasional curate in a lectureship,[4] - a comment on the improving quality of the class -, competition by beneficed clergy as well as the itinerant preachers that thrived in such position, was generally too fierce for the assistant curate.[5] Deprived of the most lucrative form of subsidiary employment, the curate yet found plenty of opportunities in obscure clerical posts such as the Hospitalership in St. Bartholomew, the Visitorship at Newgate,[6] a chaplaincy at the Guildhall or Ludgate,[7] or a position in

---

1. CUL. MS. Mm. 1,29, f.44v.
2. GLMS. 4457/2, ff.75v.-89r. passim.
3. This was Hugh Smith, curate at St. Michael Cornhill (GLMS. 4072/1, f.28r.).
4. The most notable were Edward Spendlove, Nicholas Alsop, John Eburne, and Richard Salt.
5. e.g. at St. Dunstan East, an outsider outvoted the curate by 11 to 5 in a contest for the lectureship in 1583 (GLMS. 4887, p.235
6. Both positions were in the gift of the governors.
7. The first licensed appointment at Ludgate was Anthony Fletche in 1590 (LCCRO. Eib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.4v.). Proposals were first made in 1588 (LCRO. Rep.21, f.533v.).

Bridewell.[1] Many held petty canonries at St. Paul's as well as parochial curacies.[2] Pluralism in the form of serving two curacies at the same time, was much favoured;[3] particularly popular was the combination of a donative with an assistantship, neither of which was technically a benefice, and the holder was not therefore liable to the regulations governing pluralism.[4] For the same reason, assistant curacies were sometimes taken up by those beneficed clergy whose rectorial income was evidently below subsistence level.[5] In the early years of the reign, indeed, so acute was the clerical dearth that ministers were officially encouraged to combine two cures; details survive of an order arranging details of services in such circumstances.[6] A difference of an hour was appointed in the times of morning service, so that the minister could read the New Testament lesson and the Litany at the first church, and deliver the homily (or sermon) and minister Communion in the second. As clerical recruitment improved, however, such practices struggle against the disapproval both of the ecclesiastical authorities

---

1. Customarily served by the curate of St. Bride, this was a separate position by 1598 (GLMS. 9537/9, f.158r.).
2. e.g. Wm. Beckwith (Christ Church), Th. Harrold (All Hallows Less), Th. Bendlow (St. Mary Woolchurch).
3. Supra, p.444.
4. e.g. J.Bennet (PC. of St. Mary Colechurch, curate of St.Bene Gracechurch, 1577); Th. Pratt (PC. of St. Anne Blackfriars, curate of St. Peter Westcheap, 1589).
5. e.g. Christopher Rosedale combined the rectory of St. Benet Sherehog with a curacy at St. Antholin 1577-82 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.92 .)
6. Lansd. MS. 109,28. Undated, but undoubtedly belonging to the 1559-60 period.

and parishioners, but they were not entirely stilled.[1]

Possibly the most accommodating form of subsidiary employment to a stipendiary curate was to apply for a teaching licence from the di cesan ordinary, and set up a school in the parish. The zeal of the Elizabethan citizen for education made such opportunities infinite. Large numbers of licences were granted annually, and they could have amounted to no more than a minority of the total of teachers active in London.[2] A Paul's Cross preacher, deploring the general decline in education, was careful to except London: "Thoughe Scholls heer in London are plentifull enoughe thankes be vnto god, yeat in all other places of the Realm they marvelously decay."[3] Many prospective clerics taught for a time before their ordination; one reason may have been to give them the necessary residential qualificatio for ordination in London;[4] another to fill in the time between graduation and diaconate ordination at the age of twenty-three.[5] The clerical interest in education was acknowledged in a 1604 canon which laid down that priority in running a parish school was to be given to the curate "...for the better increase of his living."[6] Occasionally, a curate obtained a post at one of the

---

1. Supra, p.444
2. Between 1580-1600, for instance, 344 teaching licences of various kinds were issued for the diocese (Lib. VG. passim). Many more must have taught without a licence.
3. Eggram, Sept. 8th, 1566 (Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10, f.86v.).
4. cf. Chapter II, pp.48-9.
5. cf. Chapter III, p.62.
6. Card. Doc. Annals, 1, 291 (No.LXXVIII).

major public schools in the city, - John Atkinson, assistant at St. Mary Colechurch, and usher at the Merchant Taylors school is a ready example[1] -, but most were confined to teaching grammar or the contents of Nowell's catechism, in the obscurity of a parish school. Joachim Ball combined his duties as assistant at St. Katherine Coleman with a school in the neighbouring parish of St. Clement Eastcheap.[2] Francis Kitchen eked out years of unbeneficed apprenticeship in instructing the children of St. Lawrence Jewry, where he was for a time curate, in the arts of reading and writing.[3] James Stopes commenced an association with St. Mary Magdalene Old Fish Street that lasted for forty-five years, with a curacy and teaching post in the parish shortly before 1580.[4] Weekday catechismal exercises must have considerably eased the Sabbatical catechising duties of the curate.

There was, it is clear, no lack of opportunity for the assistant curate in London. Financially, the remuneration varied from parish to parish in accordance with the scope of his duties, the value of the living, and the character of the parson. One factor could offset another, so that the wealthiest living

---

1. GLMS. 9537/7, f.107r.
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, f.18v.
3. Ibid. Hamond, f.325v.
4. Ibid. Hamond, f.87v.; GLMS. 9051/4, f.172r.

did not necessarily provide the highest stipend. The rector of All Hallows Great, for instance, a benefice valued at £41, offered £20 to a curate in 1597,[1] the same sum as that received by the curate at St. Mary Woolnoth, officially worth only £25, thirty years earlier.[2] The explanation lay less in a difference in function than in the character of the rector. The tithes of the latter parish were leased by the parishioners at that time, a type of parson already seen to be more benevolent with his stipend than his clerical counterpart.[3]

By rural standards, and even of those of many of the London parishes, £20 a year was a highly satisfactory salary for an assistant curate. A curate in Essex was reported as serving for £5.6.8d. and his diet in 1606-7, while as late as 1650, forty-eight curates in Lancashire and Cheshire received an average of almost exactly £7.[4] No London wage appears to have reached that depth. The lowest recorded was the £8 given to the curate at Christ Church for at least forty years post-1565.[5] £5 was the sum decreed by Bishop Sandys to be paid to the minister at St. Mary Woolchurch for six months service during the sequestration of the rectorial income;[6] possibly this was a fair guage of the episcopal attitude towards wages. The market price, however,

---

1. GLMS. 819/1, f.15r.
2. GLMS. 1002/1, f.143v.
3. Chapter VII, sub Impropriations.
4. Hill, 113,205.
5. St. Barts. Hosp. Hb.1/2 [no fol.].
6. GLMS. 1013/1, f.22v.

was probably higher, even in the early part of the reign. The wage at St. James Garlickhithe remained at £16 between 1568-77,[1] the same amount as that paid to the curate of St. Olave Hart Street in 1579.[2] At St. Andrew Hubbard, the salary rose from £14. in 1559 to £16 in 1586.[3] A more substantial concession to the rising cost of living was made at St. Olave Southwark where the stipend was increased from £13.6.8d. to £20 in 1564.[4] At St. Stephen Coleman Street, the curate earned £17.10s. for sixteen months service in 1592-3.[5] The remuneration for casual employment fluctuated more sharply. 6/- was given to a minister at St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street for a fortnight's service in 1592; in 1573-4, another had 6/8 on each of the eleven occasions he performed there.[6] On the other hand, 13/4 was the total given to Thomas Mortibois for three weeks service at St. Benet Gracechurch in 1566,[7] while Augustine Clarke returned from a Sunday service at St. Mary Woolchurch in 1594 only 18d. to the good.[8]

A differential wage system emphasised the nomadic tendencies of unbeneficed ministers. Poverty may have brought many to London, but the disparity in stipends between parishes

---

1. GLMS. 4810/1, ff.45.-50r. passim.
2. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1579-81, f.84v.
3. GLMS. 1279/2, ff.83r., 136v.
4. Bermondsey Public Library, CWA. 1546-92, p.190.
5. GLMS. 4457/2, f.32v.
6. GLMS. 2596/1, ff.154r., 193v.
7. GLMS. 1568, p.191.
8. GLMS. 1013/1, f.70v.

was largely responsible for the constant circulation of City cures in search of short-term remuneration. A minority, usually those with the ablest preaching gifts, prospered in such circumstances, and evidently felt no great anxiety to enter the beneficed ranks. The annual wage of the curate at St. Stephen Coleman Street amounted to £30 in 1593 from his duties in serving the cure, reading lectures and divine service, and delivering quarterly sermons;[1] a few years earlier, William Harrison had considered £30 a minimum satisfactory salary for a beneficed clergyman,[2] burdened as he was by forms of taxation from which the assistant curate was exempt.[3] The curate at St. Dunstan in the East augmented the £4 he earned for reading the weekday services, by another £16 by lecturing three days a week.[4] The curate of St. Peter West Cheap was also in receipt of a £10 a year salary as hospitaler at St. Bartholomew in 1593.[5] Richard Salt earned £16 as curate and preacher at Christ Church, another £10 as visitor of Newgate, and an unknown stipend as a lecturer in St. Martin Ludgate.[6] His pluralistic activity endured for about three years until his departure in 1589 to serve as

---

1. GLMS. 4457/2, f.38v.
2. Harrison's Description of England, ed. F.J.Furnivall (1877),i
3. i.e. tenths and first fruits. Curates were assessed uniformly at 6/8 for subsidies, but from the small number that appeared on the subsidy rolls by the end of the reign, it appear that this due was not consistently enforced (PRO. E.179, 44/301-13).
4. GLMS. 4887, p.243.
5. St. Barts. Hospital, Hb.1/2 [no fol.]
6. Ibid.; GLMS 1311/1, f.83v.

preacher to Lord Willoughby's forces in France.[1] Perhaps the most successful of these unbeneficed itinerants was Nicholas Alsop whose annual income from the various curacies and lectureships he held in the 1590s must have totalled about £50,[2] a sum beyond the reach of several of the heavily-taxed beneficed clergy of London.[3] Alsop's fortune endured for a decade, until he overreached himself by attempting to take over the recently-created chaplaincy at Bridewell. His claim was successfully challenged in the consistory court by the curate of St. Bride who asserted a long-established pastoral right over the inhabitants of the precinct.[4] Subsequently, Alsop's activities diminished somewhat, and he settled in the small perpetual curacy of All Hallows Less.[5] His career illustrates the opportunities open to those who, while not necessarily Puritan-minded, possessed the preaching assets that won them the patronage of London citizens.

The result was a continuous influx of clergy into the capital to improve their fortunes. Chaucer's rural parson that:

> "...ran unto London unto Powles
> To seken him a chaunterie for soules."[6]

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope,1,f.291v. The London clergy collected £30 for his maintenance in France for a month.
2. In 1594, for instance, he was curate of St.Andrew Hubbard (worth £16 p.a.); lecturer at St.Mary Woolnoth (£20); lecturer at St. Antholin (£6), as well as a casual preacher at St. Botolph Aldgate and, doubtless, elsewhere.
3. cf. Chapter VII.
4. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1605-7, f.122v. References to a chaplain at Bridewell first appeared in 1598 (GLMS. 9537/9, f.158r.).
5. Henn. 85.
6. Quoted by H.H.Milman, Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral (1868), 147.

had countless spiritual heirs in the Elizabethan period. Thomas Cobhed resigned a small living in Wiltshire "...in hope to have doen better among his frends in London diocese".[1] Others like Thomas Pullen, deserted their country cures in order to take up a curacy in the city.[2] Many more were unbeneficed, drifting into London in search of preferment, and taking assistantships in the meantime. London became the Mecca of all types and qualities of ministers, the aspiring graduate as well as the harried refugee. Both types are illustrated in the experiences of Edward Spendlove. Finchley-born, and an Oxford graduate, he was ordained by Aylmer in 1577, and shortly afterwards was preferred by Lady Anne Bacon to the vicarage of Redbourne.[3] A decade later, he was forced to resign "...by reason of a certain crime objected against me,"[4] and came in desperation to London. His plight was so precarious in 1591 that he obtained a brief from the bishop to apply for parochial relief, having a wife and four small children "...and no maner of Living or livelihood for the mayntenance of himselfe and them except only the reward of his Labor for preaching the word of God."[5] Such preaching gifts, however, could not long remain

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Examin 1574-6, f.192r.
2. GLMS. 819/1, f.15r.
3. Alumni Oxon, 1,iv,1399.
4. Records of the Old Archdeacontry of St. Al ans. Calendar of Papers, ed. H.R.Wilton Hall, St. Alban's and Hertfordshire Architectural an Archaeological Soc. (1908), 61.
5. GLMS. 9234/3, f.27r.

unrewarded in London; by 1594, he was a lecturer at St. Antholin, a radical position which he retained until his death in 1630,[1] and in 1595 he was appointed curate at St. Edmund Lombard Street.[2] The backing of his clerical colleagues later obtained for him a Northamptonshire vicarage, a living that he evidently served *in absentia*.[3]

The ministerial influx into London and the consequent intensification of competition for curacies and more casual clerical posts had two important effects, the one more beneficial than the other. In the first place, the striking improvement in the academic qualifications of assistant curates in the second half of the reign was largely due to the increasing numbers of graduates entering London in search of short-term employment in anticipation of preferment. A sample of this improvement may be taken from an estimate of curates at various dates serving parishes under episcopal jurisdiction.[4]

1561	:	3	graduates	out	of	41	curates	in	93	parishes
1583	:	7	"	"	"	31	"	"	"	"
1592	:	12	"	"	"	27	"	"	"	"
1598	"	17	"	"	"	34	"	"	"	"

In one respect, the picture reflects that of the beneficed ranks,

---

1. The Parish Registers of St. Antholin, Budge Row, ed. J.L. Chester and G.J.Armytage, Harleian Soc. (1883), viii, 64. The register entry suggests he was appointed in 1585, but the first reference to him in the CWA. is in 1594 (GLMS. 1046/1, f.51v.).
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, f.18v.
3. Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.11r.
4. The 1561 figures are taken from the certificate drawn up in that year (Mullins, 269-83). The others are based on information in the Liberi Visitationum and the university registers.

and was a tribute both to greater episcopal diligence in the admission of ordinands, and to the revival in university recruitment.[1] Between 1560-1600, the character of the London curates was transformed to an extent that could have been hardly credible on Elizabeth's accession. By the end of the century, the prospects of a London benefice for a non-graduate were remote, while his chances of any regular parochial appointment were no better than even. The effects on the pastoral duties were doubtless entirely beneficial, but the emphasis on qualifications was driving a wedge through the ranks of the curates, which in fact was creating two distinct clerical classes The one, university-trained, and generally qualified preachers, looked at a London curacy as a profitable, but essentially short term appointment, a stepping-stone to more substantial prefermen The other, with the prospects of further advancement receding, could at best do no more than cling tenaciously to existing positions. At worst, deprived of a regular curacy, the unqualified minister drifted from parish to parish in search of casual employment, until he was driven to the limits of obtaining a brief for parochial relief, or engaging in various forms of remunerative clerical irregularities, the most common being the performance of illicit marriages. There survives

---

1. cf. Chapter III.

abundant evidence of the unhappy consequences of the saturation of the London clerical market that occurred in the 1590s, and of the fate of its first victims, those lacking the qualifications considered essential by contemporary society. Christopher Hailes who at one time had been a deputy to a pluralist namesake, found employment increasingly difficult to obtain following the death of his mentor in 1588.[1] Brief tenancies at various City cures followed, but by 1597 his plight was serious. He himself deposed that he was worth twenty nobles,[2] and the bishop shortly afterwards granted him a brief to tour the London parishes "... being a poore minister...out of living."[3] Similar collections were made for a Welsh preacher "...being Destitute of any Spirituall Livings,"[4] and for another who had not had a 'competen living for two and a half years.[5] 'Poor' ministers were frequently the recipients of donations from charitable church wardens at this time.[6]

Financial indigence and vocational disillusionment sometime found expression in irregularities or moral excesses. An assistant at St. Sepulchre, reproved by Bancroft in 1598 for "...marrying a Cupple at St. Andrewes in holbone", did not

---

1. This was Robert Hailes, rector of St. Nicholas Acon and St. Clement Eastcheap (cf. SP. ii, 181-3).
2. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1597-1600, [no fol.]. sub. Jan. 27/98.
3. GLMS. 9234/7, f.72r. His later fate is not known.
4. GLMS. 9234/2, f.93r.
5. GLMS. 9234/1, f.60r. [2nd.fol.section].
6. e.g. GLMS. 577/1, ff.6v.,22r., 27v.; GLMS. 4959, f.6r.

endear himself by his retort, "I will answer you".[1] Three years later, another minister from the same parish was presented for marrying a couple without banns or licence.[2] Advantage was taken on several occasions of the exempt privilege claimed by the Lieutenant of the Tower, to perform clandestine marriages within his precinct.[3] Others were found guilty on graver issues William Locker was "despatched forthe" of his curacy at St. Dunstan West for misbehaviour, and some time later was cited in the consistory court for ill-treating his wife.[4] Henry Bradley's record was a stigma to his church, and ideal ammunition for Puritan critics. Between 1570-9, he drifted from church to church in Worcester and Oxford, eventually coming to London where he served two successive cures, although he was at the time still unabsolved from an excommunication writ passed against him. His activities were cut short, at least temporaril by Stanhope, who suspended him ostensibly on the grounds of an attempted bigamous marriage.[5]

A rift between the sections that composed the ranks of the assistant curates was not the only deleterious consequence of the improvement in their academic qualifications. The tendency

---

1. GLMS. 9537/9, [no fol.].
2. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1601-2, f.52r.
3. e.g. Robert Openshaw was accused of having done so in 1583. (GLMS. 9537/5 [no fol.]). For details of a clandestine marriage in a private house in St. Sepulchre, see LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1591-4, f.49r. et seq.
4. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1565-9, f.202r. et seq.
5. Lib. Act. 1579-81, f.147v.

among the abler ministers to look on a curacy as a short-term appointment, even at times a formality in order to comply with the canonical regulations, governing 'titles' pre-ordination, exacerbated the already inherent insecurity of the curate's position.

Basically, his instability lay in his dependence on the parson who employed him; he was protected neither by canon law nor by statute, and enjoyed none of the privileges of freehold possession afforded to his beneficed counterpart. Death or the preferment of the parson elsewhere might terminate the curate's employment in the parish; John Payne lost his curacy at St. Alban Wood Street on the removal of the rector, George Hickens, to another City living.[1] The decision of a pluralist rector to reside on his London benefice might lose the curate his position for few resi ents were in a position to employ an assistant. William Thorne departed from St. Andrew Hubbard when an absentee rector was succeeded by a resident in 1568.[2] A rector's dependence on the favour of a patron was less all-embracing than that of a curate on his parson.

Not all curates failed to survive their parson's fenure, - John Taylor, for instance, was assistant to four vicars at All Hallows Barking between 1570-c.1607 -,[3] but generally the

---

1. GLMS. 9535/2, f.29r; Hann, 72.
2. GLMS. 1279/2, f.113v.
3. While Taylor easily held the longest record, others were Dominic Jackson (curate at St. Dunstan West c.1563-1579), and Richard Young (curate at St. Dunstan West c.1581-1615).

practice lent itself to a system of short-term appointments. This appears to have been particularly evident in those parishes where the vestry had managed to secure the nomination, or at least a voice in the appointment, of the assistant minister. This tendency was characteristic of the contemporary trend towards greater lay control of the ecclesiastical activities of the parish. Sometimes a non-resident incumbent, who let out the revenues of the benefice to the parishioners, also delegated to them the nomination of a minister to serve the cure. At St. Dunstan East, the appointment was for many years retained by the vestry until the collation of a strong-minded rector led to the restoration of rectorial rights; even then the curate was pledged to be of a standard acceptable to the parishioners.[1] At St. Olave Southwark, the position was transformed within a decade. Customarily, the appointment was made by the parson who in 1598 agreed to provide a minister "...to the liking of the parish." In 1603, he promised to appoint no-one of whom the parish disapproved. In 1604, the vestry itself elected a candidate by majority vote, after he had delivered a trial sermon, and the choice was confirmed by the parson.[2] This was another symptom of the trend towards congregational election that has already been noted in the appointment of lecturers and

---

1. A.G.B.West, The Church and Parish of St. Dunstan in the East, 51.
2. Bermondsey Public Library, VM. 1551-1604, ff.104r.-116r. passim.

the purchase of advowsons.

Where direct control was not possible, indirect pressure was often exerted. Twenty shillings was offered to the curate of St. Margaret Pattens to hasten his removal so that a parochial nominee could be admitted.[1] The initiative at All Hallows Great was taken up by the church- ardens who "...with ther dylleygence and paynes but especyally throughe gods provydence Happened to mete with Mr. Pullye whoo with Mr.= Dr. Balgay's [rector] consent and Apoyntment was procured to serve the cure."[2]

Notoriously capricious in their attitude towards the clergy citizens were not loath to ring the changes where they could. Beckwith at Christ Church, Baugh at All Hallows, Kelly at St. Saviour's Southwark, Dawes at St. Margaret Pattens, and Salford in Aldermanbury, ere probably only a few among many who suffered from parochial displeasure. The consequences of lay control were to intensify the tenurial insecurity inherent in an assistant curacy, and which was becoming increasingly pronounced in the last twenty years of the reign as competition for cures grew with the influx of university-recruited ministers into London. The result was that very drift "...from Churche to Church to see what parsons have wanted Curates to serve them,"

---

1. GLMS. 4570/2, p.46.
2. GLMS. 819/1, f.15r.

condemned by contemporary critics.[1]

Twelve curates followed one another within a dozen years at St. Andrew Hubbard, of whom seven ere graduates.[2] William Cotton, rector of St. Margaret New Fish Street, likewise, rang his changes a dozen times between 1583-95.[3] At least seven curates served at St. Botolph Bishopsgate between 1589-96.[4] At least eight curates are known to have been employed at St. Andre Wardrobe in the last twenty years of the century.[5] Robert Rogers, one of the two assistants at St. Sepulchre, had four different colleagues within as few years between 1596-1600.[6]

Individual careers emphasise even more strongly the migratory habits of those unable to penetrate the beneficed ranks. William Hickocks, for instance, was a native of Waddesdon in Buckinghamshire, who at the age of thirty-five obtained a licence to serve a City cure. The institution of a new incumbent cut short his tenure, and he departed for Chester where he spent the following eight years. In 1596, he moved to Essex; six months later, he was back in London, and held a curacy at St. Mary Somerset until the rector moved elsewhere. The next eighteen months were spent in the curacy of Notley Alba in Essex, but Hickock's heart was evidently in the capital;

---

1. SP. i, 131.
2. Appendix B, p. 606
3. Ibid, p. 613
4. Ibid. pp 608-9
5. Ibid. pp 606 7
6. Ibid. p. 621

his last recorded cure was at St. Sepulchre where he was given an assistantship by a new incumbent in 1599.[1] John Payne, born in Tattersall, Lincoln diocese, came to London to seek orders in 1584. He attached himself to George Dickens, a chaplain to Aylmer, and was employed at St. Alban Wood Street and St. Lawrence Jewry for some time. In 1589, he obtained an Essex vicarage, but his incumbency was short-lived; by 1591, he had returned as Dicken's assistant in the Jewry.[2] The death of his mentor in 1594 cut short Payne's own tenure, and he appears to have disappeared from London. Christopher Hales confined his activities to the capital, although he was a native of Cumberland. Between 1585-92, he served in at least six parishes, and during the next decade was employed at four others.[3]

Formally, the ecclesiastical authorities were well-equipped to regulate the peripatetic habits of unbeneficed ministers. Letters dimissory were intended to control inter-diocesan migration.[4] Testimonials from persons of influence in the area of previous service were required before a minister was allowed to serve a cure in another diocese. Above all, permission to take up a cure was conditional on the grant of a licence, obtainable either from archbishop or bishop, but in the great

---

1. The bulk of this information is drawn from a deposition made by Hickocks in the consistory court in 1599 (LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1597-1600 [no fol.] sub. Oct. 23/99.).
2. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1591-4 [no fol.], April 23/94.
3. Ibid. 1597-1600, Jan.27/98; GLMS. 9537/8, f.80r. and v.
4. cf. Chapter II, p.47.

majority of cases, from the latter. Its issue was conditional on the exhibition of testimonials, a preliminary examination, and the subscription of the candidate to the articles of religion, to a vow of canonical obedience, and, from 1585 onwards, to the three articles of Whitgift.[1]

The difficulty lay in the enforcement of these regulations. Contrary to Puritan complaints of the issue of general licences allowing curates to serve anywhere in the diocese,[2] the great majority of those granted in London tied the holder to a specific church. Should his tenure be cut short, however, the licence was neither invalidated nor amended, but appears to have been tenable in churches he subsequently held. Christopher Hailes, for instance, obtained a licence to serve the cure of St. Clement Eastcheap in 1584;[3] fourteen years later he was still exhibiting this licence, although he was then curate of St. Andrew Undershaft, and had served at least six parishes in the intervening period.[4] Very rarely, except following some form of irregularity on the part of the grantee, was a licence revised in such circumstances.[5]

A licensed curate had at least been subjected to the

---

1. Subscription to Whitgift's articles are almost invariable after April, 1585. (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i,f.46v. et seq.)
2. SP. i,266.
3. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i,f.36v.
4. GLMS. 9537/9, f.181r.
5. An exception was John Glasse, licensed curate at Islington in 1577, and at Clerkenwell in the following year (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, ff.92v.,101r.). The fact that the latter was a perpetual, not an assistant, curacy, may have been the reason.

inspection of the ordinary. A more intractable problem was that caused by the infiltration of unlicensed ministers, who produced neither dimissories nor testimonials, into London cures. Neither his activities could be regulated nor his quality tested. The authorities relied heavily on the triennial episcopal visitations for the detection of such offenders. Its temporary nature restricted its value, for several curates could pass through a parish within a period of three years. Within its limits, however, the visitatorial technique was highly effective, as is indicated by the increase in the number of licences granted after a visitation.[1] Eight curates were inhibited by Sandys during his 1574 visitation for failing to produce their licences;[2] a similar number were penalised in 1586. Edward Beck was inhibited for entering the diocese without any testimonials,[4] James Stone for failing to produce dimissories from the bishop of Lincoln,[5] and William Pegrim for "...that he hath not now his letters of orders."[6] Nevertheless, a few

---

1. e.g. licences issued for the whole diocese between 1580-95 (Visitation years marked thus *).

* 1580 : 39	1585 : 23	1590: 25
1581 : 10	* 1586 : 22	1591: 29
1582 : 5	1587 : 20	* 1592: 48
* 1583 : 45	1588 : 16	1593: 10
1584 : 8	* 1589 : 60	1594: 14
		* 1595: 47

2. GLMS. 9537/3, passim.
3. GLMS. 9537/6, passim.
4. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, xvi, f.3v.
5. Ibid. f.3v.
6. Ibid. f.14v.

evaded episcopal detection for several years. Richard Holmes, for instance, was curate at St. Alphage for six years before he was granted a licence.[1] Thomas Marbury obtained a licence five years after his ordination, and four years after his appointment to serve the sequestered living of St. Bartholomew Less in 1577.

Discipline tightened in the last twenty years of the century under the combined vigilance of Aylmer and Stanhope, but irregularities could not be entirely extinguished. They were symptoms of a situation where the influx into London, on the one hand, of university clergy anxious for short-term employment in anticipation of more substantial preferment, and, on the other, of dispossessed or disillusioned country ministers attracted by the opportunities for casual but lucrative remuneration, was saturating the clerical market in the capital. Where tenure was so tenuous, movement was often continuous; with differential wage systems operating in neighbouring parishes, drift was inevitable. The beneficiary was the man whose educational qualifications and preaching assets brought him the attention of the private patron and the favour of the London citizen. The victim was the 'unlearned' minister, the product generally of the Grindalian or pre-Elizabethan period. The changing religious values of a zealously Protestant society

---

1. GLMS. 1432/2 [no fol.]; LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.218r.
2. GLMS. 9535/1, f.154r.; Lib. VG. Hamond, f.252r.

brought little consolation to those trained to a less arduous concept of ministerial vocation.

CHAPTER TEN

CLERICAL NONCONFORMITY (I). THE VESTIARIAN CONTROVERSY.[1]

Certain dates stand out as landmarks in the history of clerical Puritanism in London. They are remarkable in that they represented the high-water marks of nonconformity, and at the same time, inaugurated a period of Anglican retrenchment. The general impression that results is not of the "...rapid and steady growth of the Puritan school of thought"[2] during the forty years post-1563, but of the ebb and flow that characterised the movement in the country as a whole, and the fluctuations that followed from the emphasis of government policy at a particular time, and the thoroughness with which this policy was applied by the diocesan authorities. First, and the most far-reaching in its consequence, of these dates, was the Lambeth meeting of March 26th, 1566; subsequently the landmarks cannot be dated so precisely. They include that part of Sandys' tenure of office that lay between 1571-4; the 1578-83 phase that saw the rise and fall of nonconformist lectureships in the City; and the emergence and overwhelming of the threat incurred between 1586-

---

1. No attempt is made in this, and the following chapter, to bring out the inspiration behind the Elizabethan Puritan moveme both in the realm of ideas and politics. Such a task has been rendered superfluous by Dr. P.Collinson's monumental work, The Puritan Classical Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth I (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London 1957). These two chapters are intended merely to trace the fortunes of those parish clergymen who, for different reasons as the reign progressed, found themselves on the radical wing of the established church.
2. This was the view held by Miss M.Cornford in the VCH.(p.309

-89 by the influx of Scottish Presbyterian ministers into London. It is proposed to build our discussion of the fortunes of clerical Puritanism around these climacteric dates.

The 1566 crisis must be explained not only by the immediate background of the vestiarian controversy, but by factors that went back to the religious settlement of 1559. Most significant of these factors was the re-distribution of personnel among both the dignitaries of the London church and the parish clergy. The accession to the episcopate of Grindal, a man whose views on church policy had been moulded by his apprenticeship as chaplain to Nicholas Ridley, and by his exile in Strasbourg and Frankfort and whose scruples on the lawfulness of wearing vestments and receiving impropriations of tithes, caused him to hesitate befor accepting the office,[1] was in itself a favourable portent to the emergence of a reforming party in London. His disposal of the patronage that lay in his hands confirmed his determination to maintain the associations of his exile. Four out of five of his first archdiaconal appointments had been abroad during Mary's reign;[2] at least two of them - Mullins and Nowell - had been

---

1. He first consulted Peter Martyr who advised him not to decline a bishopric on such slender grounds - a conclusion which Grindal had in fact already reached. For Grindal's views on habits in 1559, cf. Zurich Letters 1558-79, ed. H.Robinson, Parker Soc. (1842), i,169.
2. John Mullins (London); Alexander Nowell (Middlesex); Thomas Cole (Essex), and John Pullin (Colchester). The exception was David Kemp (St. Alban's).

colleagues of Grindal at Frankfurt.[1] On Nowell's appointment as dean of St. Paul's in 1560, the archdeaconry of Middlesex was filled by Thomas Watts, another exile who had shared a house with Mullins in 1557.[2] In the civilian field of ecclesiastical administration, the chancellorship of the diocese was granted in 1561 to Thomas Huick, recently returned from Geneva;[3] the officialship to the archdeacon of London went to John Orphinstang, classified as a student in the census of exiles,[4] and Thomas Donnell, formerly of Frankfurt, became commissary of the Stortford area.[5]

Watts and Mullins, entered the bishop's household as domestic chaplains on their return from exile;[6] Nicholas Carvile (Kervy), returning from Geneva, was dispensed to hold in plurality by virtue of his chaplaincy to Grindal in 1560.[7] James Calfhill and John Philpot, two young radicals whose zeal was later to be tempered by the rod of Anglican discipline, were Grindalian ordinands and chaplains.[8] The available prebends of

---

1. Christine H.Garrett, The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism 1553-59. (Cambridge 1938), 234, 238.
2. Ibid. 323.
3. Ibid. 149 (as Duwick).
4. Ibid. 243, where he is described as "...attached to the archdeaconry of London by 1562". He was appointed Official before December 1560 (Mullins, 255).
5. Garrett, op.cit. 145.
6. GLMS. 9535/1, f.97v.
7. PRO. SP. 12/76, f.13r. His name was variously spelt Carovil, Kervy, Carvell. (See also Garrett, op.cit. 110).
8. GLMS. 9535/1, f.108r.; PRO SP. 12/76, f.25v.

St. Paul's provided a satisfactory sinecural emolument to several exiles; all four emigré archdeacons held prebendal stall by 1561,[1] and room for two other exiles was found amongst the canons.[2] A chapter of thirty members that included seven exiles and at least three others who had lost their preferments during Mary's reign,[3] and which in1560 elected as dean, Alexander Nowell who had subscribed to the New Discipline in 1537,[4] was itself a powerful force for reform, and was not reluctant to exploit its patronage of twenty-one City livings to this purpose.

With the bishop's household and the cathedral strongly leavened with radical feeling, there was ample opportunity for the emergence and growth of a strong core of reformist clergy in the City livings. A nucleus was provided by the restoration of ministers to the benefices which they had lost on the accession of Mary. Amongst these were the Frenchmen, Peter Alexander and John Veron, both of whom had established reputations as advanced Protestants under Ridley.[5] Veron, who had been imprisoned

---

1. Mullins obtained the prebend of Kentish Town in 1559 (Henn. 35). Cole had Rugmere in 1560 (p.48); Watts, Tattenhall, 1559 (p.51), Pullen, Wenlakesbarn in 1561 (p.53).
2. Humphrey Alcockson (p.28); and Robert Harrington (p.16) who may be identified as the Frankfort exile noted by Garret (p.178) and was ordained deacon by Grindal in 1560. (Strype, Grindal, 54-5).
3. John Standish (Henn. 25); John Spendlove (p.31); John Veron (p.38). Other prebendaries of known radical views were Thomas Penny (p.41), whose whereabouts in Mary's reign are not known (DNB.), and David Pady (p.49). (See his Paul's Cross sermon, Sept.1/1566 in Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10, ff.76v.-83v.).
4. Garrett, op.cit. 238.
5. DNB.

between 1553-58, was further rewarded with the rectory of St. Martin Ludgate, and in 1560 he exchanged his small living of St. Alphage for the well-endowed vicarage of St. Sepulchre.[1] Another veteran reformer to return, in this case from Strasbourg was the literary controversialist, Thomas Beacon. He was patronised by Robert Dudley, who in 1560 successfully nominated him to Christ Church, a gift of the Lord Mayor and his corporation, despite a cross-petition by Grindal on behalf of Veron.[2] In 1563, St. Dionis Backchurch fell to Beacon by the favour of the dean and chapter of Canterbury Cathedral where he held a prebendal stall.[3] Another veteran exile was Thomas Mountain, ordained in Henry VIII's reign and imprisoned for heresy in 1553. He escaped to Antwerp, and in 1559, returned, no to his previous City benefice, but to the more substantial living of St. Faith and St. Pancras Soper Lane.[4] Humphrey Perkins, an ex-religious, whose place of continental exile is not known, regained his Westminster prebend and the rectory of St. Margaret New Fish Street.[5] John Pullen, Archdeacon of Colchester, was restored to the living of St. Peter Cornhill, but resigned it in 1561.[6]

A younger group of post-Edwardian reformers, whose views ha

---

1. Henn. 293,383. cf. Appendix A.
2. LCRO. Rep.14, ff.210v., 245v.
3. DNB.
4. Garrett, op.cit. 233-4.
5. Ibid. 249.
6. Ibid. 262-3; Henn. 375.

matured in the fervid atmosphere of their continental refuge, also found ready preferment among the sympathetic citizens of London. Although some of these were Edwardian ordinands, they had little pastoral experience before 1559. Most prominent of the group was Robert Crowley, made a priest in 1551, whose advanced economic theories had been developed before 1553. His clerical reputation, however, was established during his exile in Frankfort, and he was rewarded for his approval of the Anglican Prayer Book by the archdiaconate of Hereford, a dignitary in the gift of the former exile, Bishop Scory. His position in London was secured by a prebend in St. Paul's, and the living of St. Peter le Poer (in the patronage of the chapter) He was later collated to the wealthy vicarage of St. Giles Cripplegate, and became the unofficial leader of the radical core of City clergy who were unwilling to compromise on the vestiarian issue. His eloquence as a preacher, his ability with the pen, and his popularity with influential citizens, all helped to raise him to an exalted position by 1566.[1]

Crowley,was, however, no more than primus inter pares amongst a group of exiles who returned to serve City cures. Richard Langhorne, a man of sufficient substance to be made a burgher of Frankfort in 1555, and who subscribed to the Genevan proposal in 1559 for an anti-ceremonial crusade, returned to England to be ordained by Grindal in 1560, and was immediately

---

1. A.Peel has sketched Crowley's life in his Robert Crowley: Puritan, Printer, Priest., The Presbyterian Historial Society of England (1937); but does little to bring out the importance of his later career in London.

preferred to the living ofSt. Mary Colechurch, a gift of the Company of Mercers.[1] Another was Thomas Horton whose services as a messenger between London and Frankfort were acknowledged by Grindal by the grant of the rectory of St. Magnus, reputed to be the wealthiest living in the City.[2] Robert Coles, dramatised by Fox as a principal teacher of heretical doctrine in Marian London, and likewise a messenger, obtained the rectory of St. Mary le Bow, the central church in the deanery of Arches.[3]

The number of livings available for returning exiles in 1559-60 was, however, limited; nearly a score of incumbents were flexible enough in their views to retain the benefice they had held under Mary, while priority elsewhere was often given to those ministers deprived on account of marriage in 1553-4, and now wishing to be reinstated.[4] This may explain why several returning emigrés found no better immediate prospects than a City curacy. Thomas Warter remained for three years on an annual stipend of £14 as curate of St. Andrew Hubbard before obtaining an Essex vicarage;[5] Richard Lynbrough, likewise a subscriber to the New Discipline in 1557, served the cure of St. Thomas Apostl

---

1. Garrett, op.cit. 215-6.
2. Ibid. 101-2.
3. Ibid. 121-2.
4. cf. Mullins, 215.
5. GLMS. 1279/2, ff.83r.-92r. He became vicar of Great Badow, Essex, in 1561 (GLMS. 9531/13, f.121r.)

on behalf of the non-resident incumbent.[1] Walter Kelly, an Aarau exile, whose age on his ordination as priest in 1560 (60 years) made his prospects of preferment remote, obtained a similar post in St. Saviour's Southwark.[2] Others, while serving a London curacy, were somewhat compensated by a country living, which they held in absentia. Edmund Thompson was for a short time curate of St. Olave Hart Street as well as vicar of South Mimms;[3] while William Porrage, a student exile whose miraculous escape on the way from Calais to Sandwich gave him prominence in Fox's chronicles, appeared to have held both a Norwich living and a curacy in St. Peter West Cheap.[4]

With this liberal sprinkling of returned emigrés in both the higher offices of the church and amongst the parish clergy,[5]

---

1. He witnessed the wills of parishioners 1561-2 (GLMS. 9051/3, f.14r.). He was probably ordained deacon by Grindal (as Richard Lymborne) Oct.18/1560; of All Hallows Thames St.; born in Oxfordshire, aged 38. (GLMS. 9535/1, f.95v.). Nothing is known of his career post-1562; possibly he was a victim of the plague outbreak of 1563.
2. Garrett, op.cit. 203. VM. St. Saviour Southwark, 1557-81, passim.
3. Garrett, op.cit. 304-5. Mullins, 248.
4. Garrett, op.cit. 258. He was collated to the rectory of Grimston, Norwich, by the archbishop in 1560. (Reg. Parker, i, 186), and resigned it before 1561.
5. In 1561, the bishop, the archdeacon, two of the ecclesiastical judges with authority in the City, six members, apart from Mullins, (including the dean) of the chapter of St. Paul's; eight incumbents, and four assistant curates of London parishes were former exiles. As to their continental whereabout -taking 1557 as a representative year -, nine out of the total of twenty-two were residing in Frankfort (of whom six subscribed to the New Discipline); two in Strasbourg; two in Aarau; two in Geneva; one in Duisburg. The precise location of the remaining six is not known.

the prospect of London leading the movement for ecclesiastical reform was as immediate as it was anticipated.

The enthusiasm of its citizens for a radical Protestant form of service found expression in the iconoclasm that destroyed many of the outward symbols of the former religion. The great majority of the altars and rood-lofts, were removed during the first year of the reign, those of the cathedral being taken down on August 12th 1559.[1] Vestments were sold, often at a handsome profit for the parish.[2] Chalices were sold, or melted down, and converted into communion cups.[3] In some churches the organs were removed,[4] and the pulpit transferred to a more focal position in the centre of the nave.[5] Vestry decisions were responsible for the alterations in the parts of the church owned by the parishioners, and it was their excesses that led to the royal proclamation of September 1560 against breaking or defacing monuments of antiquity set up in churches.[6]

---

1. VCH. 306-7.
2. The value of the vestments sold by the parishioners of St. Mary Woolnoth in 1559 amounted to £100 (GLMS. 1002/1, f.94r.). The vestry men of St. Benet Gracechurch decided in 1562 that the vestments which "...now by law maye not be occupied shall be sould to the most valewe". The money was to be used in the maintenance of the service and for church renovations. (GLMS. 1568, p.144).
3. GLMS. 2968/1, f.201v.; MS. 4887, p.173.
4. GLMS. 645/1, f.61v.; MS.4810/1, f.16r. 162 lbs. of old organ pipes were sold by the parishioners of St. Mary Woolnoth in 1562. (GLMS. 1002/1, f.104v.).
5. GLMS. 1432/2 [no fol.] (1559-60); MS. 4570/2, p.4.
6. LCRO. Journals, 17,f.267r. A subsequent proclamation (Oct. 1561) for the reverent usage of all churches and churchyards unspecified "...dyvers outragious and unseemly behaviours used also within and nere the Cathedrall Churche of Saint Paule in London" (ibid. 18, f.1r.).

There was much sympathy for the citizens on the part of the ex-Frankfort exile, Archdeacon Mullins; he himself was responsible for 'defacying' a number of mass-books, banners and beads in the church of St. Martin Orgar,[1] and for the removal of the three steps dividing the chancel of St. Benet Gracechurch from the nave.[2] An order to the church-wardens of St. Magnus by the bishop in 1562 that "...they shulde breake or cause to be broken in two peces all the oultere stones in the same churche"[3] indicates the solidarity of the diocesan authorities on this point. Two stones on the church-wall of St. Margaret Pattens "...which wer moluments of ydolatrye" were taken down in 1562 despite the royal proclamation.[4]

Evidence of the infiltration of reformed continental views on church fabric is seen in the whitewashing of church-walls and the painting of the Ten Commandments and Scriptural texts upon them.[5] A more spectacular innovation was the Genevan custom of singing the metrical version of the psalms, which was first adopted in the traditionally radical parish of St. Antholin in 1559, and became general in City churches in the following year

---

1. GLMS. 959/1, f.19r.
2. GLMS. 1568, p.136.
3. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.69r.
4. GLMS. 4570/2, p.40.
5. VCH. 307.
6. Machyn noted "...the nuw mornying prayer at sant Antholyns in Boge-row, after Geneve fassyon - be-gyne to rynge at V in the mornying; men and women all do syng, and boys." (The Diary of Henry Machyn 1550-63, ed.J.G.Nichols, Camden Soc. 42 (1847), 212.).

At Paul's Cross the whole congregation joined in the singing after the sermon,[1] and this was the practice followed in the City sessions of Grindal's visitation in 1561.[2] The purchase of what were called 'Geneve Books' appeared in several parish account books;[3] indeed, they seem to have been more widespread than the new Book of Common Prayer authorised in 1559, for very few copies of the latter were purchased in these early years.[4]

"Whe owght to helpe that fled for the word of God, and to gyff them a lyffyng", declared a London preacher in 1559.[5] Citizens were quick to respond to this suggestion. Three of the four City livings that lay in the gift of the Mayor and his aldermen fell vacant between 1559-1560; the exile, John Pullen, was restored to St. Peter Cornhill which he had lost in 1554; Thomas Beacon was given the vicarage of Christ Church; and the third went to a veteran reformer whose Marian abode is unknown.[6] Four livings in the gift of City companies were likewise vacant;

---

1. "You may now sometimes see at Paul's Cross," wrote Jewel to Martyr in March 1560, "after the service, six thousand persons, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together and praising God". This lay participation in 'church music' he argued, was an important influence in the establishment of the reformed religion. (Zurich Letters, i, 71.).
2. GLMS. 9537/2, f.23r.
3. e.g. Two "sallme bokes of geneva tome of ye grettest" were purchased by the parish of All Hallows Staining in 1561. (GLMS. 4956/2, f.66r.). Eight 'geneva books' were bought by St.Michael Cornhill (GLMS. 4071/1, f.61v.).
4. VCH. 307.
5. Machyn, op.cit. 216. The preacher was Reginald West rector-designate of St. Margaret Pattens.
6. Henn. 375, 125, 287. The latter was Reginald West.

two went to emigrés, another to a minister deprived in 1554 for marriage, and the last to a newly made Grindalian ordinand.[1]

Pointers to the tenor of clerical nonconformity between 1560-6 are provided by casual references, such as the boast of a City preacher in 1563 that "...he had made eight sermons in London against surplices rockets, tippets, and caps, counting them not to be perfect that do wear them"[2], and Crowley's assertion in 1566 that the opposition to these habits had been "...openly set forth in the pulpit these seven yeres: without any grete contradiction".[3] Irregularites, however, generally came to light only when proceedings were commenced against offenders; before 1565, few such actions occurred. Radical feeling in these years can be judged not by quoting examples of nonconformity, but by our knowledge of the personnel of the clergy and the opinions they held. In this way, the Lambeth meeting of March 26th, 1566 may be seen as a drastic measure to deal with a situation that was the logical climax of seven years of clerical radicalism governed by a tolerant diocesan hierarchy. "And now my lord of London," wrote Parker to Cecil

---

1. Ibid. 284 (Langhorne); 386 (Becon), 332 (Willoughby); 77 (Brady). Another exile, Bendall, obtained St. Stephen Walbrook (in the gift of the Grocers' Co.) when it fell vacant in 1564 (p.386).
2. W.H.Frere, The English Church In the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1904), 95.
3. In 'An Answere for the Tyme, to the Examination put in Print without the authors name, pretending to mayntayne the apparrell prescribed against the declaration of the mynesters of London (1566).

at the height of the 1566 crisis, "by experience feeleth and seeth the marks and bounds of these good sprights, which, but for his tollerations etc, had been suppressed for 5 or 6 years ago, and had prevented all this unquietness now taken..."[1]

Among the thirty-three members of the lower house of Convocation in 1563, who signed proposals for radical alterations in church services, including the abolition of copes caps and surplices, of saint days, and of the sign of the Cross in baptism, and made it optional to kneel on receiving Holy Communion, were the dean of St. Paul's, four of the five archdeacons of the diocese (including Mullins), Calfhill and Crowley who held City livings, and Wiburn who shortly afterwards obtained one.[2] Another motion of a similar kind but also advocating the abolition of organs in church service, included the same sponsors (with the exception of Mullins who was not present) as well as Thomas Beacon.[3]

With the exception of Calfhill, they had all been exiles, who retained the leadership of the radical clergy until 1566. Their distribution was weakened by the death of Peter Alexander in 1563 and the premature loss of the 'pastor' of St. Magnus,

---

1. Parker Corr. 284 (5 June, 1566).
2. J. Strype, Annals of the Reformation (Oxford 1824), 1,500-2.
3. Ibid. 502-5. This was the famous resolution that was finally defeated by 59-58 votes. For a survey of the Elizabethan compromise on ceremonial see W.P.M.Kennedy, Studies in Tudor History (1916), 143-164.

Thomas Horton, in the plague of the same year.[1] Some others serving as curates had obtained livings elsewhere and had left London by 1563,[2] but these losses were more than adequately compensated. Miles Coverdale, who had appeared in a 'Genevan' black gown at Archbishop Parker's consecration in 1559, recovered from an attack of the plague to be collated by Grindal to Horton's old benefice, where his objections to vestments were tolerated for the following two years.[3] John Bendall was another former exile preferred to a City living in 1563,[4] but a more formidable radical protagonist was Percival Wiburn, instituted to St. Sepulchre on the death of Veron.[5] Distinguished among his fellow emigrés for his learning, his comparative youthfulness may well have qualified him as Crowley's successor had not Parker dealt so decisively with him in 1566.

Despite some losses by death or retirement elsewhere, there remained nine former exiles in twelve City benefices as well as two curates deputising for non-resident incumbents on the outbreak of the vestiarian controversy in 1565.[6] In three instances, no trace of nonconformists behaviour since 1559 can

---

1. Henn. 78,274. Other radical fatalities in this year of plague were John Veron (ibid. 293), and William Baldwyn, a violent Protestant. (A Survey of London by John Stow, ed. C.L. Kingsford (Oxford 1908), i,X, note 3.
2. i.e. Warter, Thompson, and perhaps Lynbrough.
3. DNB.
4. Henn. 386.
5. Ibid. 383. Wiburn was aged 30 in 1563.
6. I.e. Crowley (2); Becon (2); Mountain (2); Wiburn; Bendall Coverdale; Coles; Perkins; Langhorne. The two curates were Porrage and Kelly.

found,[1] but the solidarity of the remainder on the question of vestiarian reform remained unbroken until 1565. They were, however, no more than the nucleus of a much wider body of clerical supporters by this time.

The majority of this latter group were Elizabethan ordinands. A few were middle-aged converts to the radical cause, allowed into the ministry on account of the shortage of clergy in 1559-60. These were sometimes undistinguished academically, a deficiency seized upon by their critics.[2] Robert Sheriff, for instance, knowing very little Latin, and unable to preach, could perhaps appreciate little of the more academic objections to the surplice, yet he was one of the few to defy Parker to the point of deprivation.[3] Thomas Earl, who wrote of the Book of Common Prayer - "A Bok say they teaken forthe of the popes stynckyng portuse/full of Intollerable pollutyons...", was not sufficiently qualified to obtain a preaching licence until 1587.[4] The same aspersion could not, however, be cast on the abilities of John Gough and Giles Seyntcler, both of whom were over forty years old on entering the ministry; the former was sufficiently well-known to become a Paul's Cross preacher,[5] while

---

1. Mountain, Bendall, Perkins.
2. e.g. Parker to Cecil, 28 March, 1566 "For as the most part of these recusants, I would wish them out of the ministry, as mere ignorant and vain heads." (Corr. 276).
3. Henn, 86.
4. CUL. MS. Mm.1,29, f.1v, f.52r.
5. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50,10, f.33v.

the latter had an Oxford B.A. to his name.[1]

Most of the active supporters of the emigrê group were still comparatively young men in 1566. Several of them emerged at the age of 24-26 years to be ordained by Grindal and were immediately preferred to a City living. Without former pastoral experience, they may have found it difficult to resist the pressure of popular radical feeling. In some cases, certainly, nonconformity was no more than a temporary phase. Henry Bedell, an Oxford graduate, was ordained in 1561 at the age of twenty-four, and obtained two City livings. His scruples over the surplice was apparently acute but not sustained, and he was among those who benefited from a belated submission in 1566. A similar flexibility is discernible in the careers of Robert Buckberd and John Scarlet, two other young men thrust into City cures in their mid-twenties.[2]

Not all of Grindal's young ordinands were prepared to compromise. John Philpot, a household chaplain, became one of Crowley's chief lieutenants, and shared in his fate despite his privileged position with the bishop. A lifelong rebel was Nicholas Standen. Ordained priest in 1564 (aged 24) his City origin as well as radical views may explain his popularity with the citizens; the parishioners of St. Margaret Pattens 'paid off

---

1. GLMS. 9535/1, f.108. See Appendix A for Seyntcler's (Sinclair, Seyntloe) tenure at All Hallows Staining.
2. Infra, pp 494, 516

their curate so that Standen could replace him, and obtained a reversionary presentation to the benefice for him.[1] Richard Allen, a Lincolnshire native who came to London in 1560, for ordination at the age of twenty-four, obtained a lectureship at Christ Church Newgate Street where his views may have been moulded by those of the vicar, Thomas Beacon.[2] The Puritan part in London post-1566 became dominated by such zealots as these, and suffered much from the absence of moderate influences

This miscellaneous group of men, a blend of former exiles, of middle-aged ordinands called to the ministry in a wave of enthusiasm following the death of Mary, and of ardent young Grindalian protégés, some of whom had spent their adolescence in the London of the Bonner régime, formed the spearhead of the resistence of the City parish clergy to Parker's policy of uniformity. The three leaders, Crowley, Gough and Philpot can be said to epitomise the elements that made up the group;[3] Crowley was the veteran Frankfort exile, Gough was the mature convert, and Philpot, at the age of twenty-six, represented the least experienced and most enthusiastic wing. The solidarity

---

1. GLMS. 4570/2, p.46.
2. He was also for a short time the perpetual curate of St. Katherine Cree. (Mullin, 259). Miss Garrett (op.cit. 71) wrongly speculated that he may have been the Thomas Allen who was an exile in Aarau, and a native of Canterbury.
3. Stow described them as the "...moaste ernyste withstandars of ye lawes of this realm...consernynge ye ordar of mynstracions and ye greatest animators of all ye wholl cite to do the lyke, upon whom ye greatest numbar of other mynyster dyd depend..." (Chronicles, 139).

of such a hybrid association was by its nature precarious; based on a common agreement on minimum reforms necessary in the church it endured so long as the ultimate test, - deprivation -, was not employed.

A caveat must be inserted against isolating too sharply the radical group from the rest of their colleagues in London livings. There was, admittedly, a substantial 'carry-over' of Marian (or pre-Edwardian) priests forming a not-negligible conservative influence whose solidarity was to be exposed in their rejection of Grindal's compromise in February 1566. Among the remainder, however, there were a number of minor reformers whose humbler form of proselytism within the confines of their own parishes remained unrecorded, but may have played a part in the formation of radical opinion. Their testaments sometimes hint at the nature of their sympathies, Thomas Watson, minister of All Hallows the Less, who died in 1564, wished that his corpse "...be accompanied with the faithful children of god to the place of burial" - an utterance that was later characteristi of the more extreme radicals. His mentor was perhaps Richard Allen to whom Watson bequeathed a Bible and Bullinger's works on the New Testament on the condition that he preach four sermons in specified City churches.[1] William Woodley, included among his friends, Archdeacon Mullins and the abovesaid Watson,

---

1. LCCRO. Cons. Ct. Regr., Bullock, f.58v.

and among his books a work by Hooper, and the 'Geneva Bible'.[1] James Cooke, rector of St. Alphage, left to his son, "...my genevey byble the new Testament: Latten and English after erasmus my genevey gramer..."[2] Other isolated clues emerge from the diary of Henry Machyn who recorded the fiery Protestantism of Reginald West, the 'pastor' of St. Margaret Pattens, and Thomas Harrold's defiance of the Prayer Book regulation in christening a child without a godfather, saying "...yt was butt a seremony".[3] Harrold was at the time curate of St. Olave Southwark; he later obtained a petty canonry at St. Paul's and served in various City cures.[4] These illustration suggest the extent of reformist feeling in London amongst the less articulate clerical elements as well as the active protagonists who formed the spearhead of the nonconformist movement.

With this picture of the composition of the radical party in London in mind, some account of the vestiarian controversy can now be given. An unexpected omen was provided by the decision of the vestry of St. Saviour's Southwark on January 2, 1565, to give notice to their curate, Walter Kelly, for refusing to "..lmynystar Acordynge unto the quenys booke...that ys for

---

1. Ibid. f.47r.
2. GLMS. 9051/3, f.127v.
3. Machyn, op.cit. 216,242.
4. Henn. 67

to saye At the Comynyon And mynystrasyon of the same for to were a Surplys Accordynglie unto the same booke."[1] This, the first known Elizabethan case of clerical ejection for Puritan nonconformity, ante-dated that of Brokelsby, the first such incumbent to be deprived, by three months.[2] Its originality lay in that it was a parochial resolution, arrived at without any apparent pressure from a superior ecclesiastical authority; this manifestation of lay loyalty to the apparel prescribed in the royal injunctions, was strangely out of character with the widespread support given to the nonconformits in 1566 by London citizens and, indeed, with the Puritan sympathies of the succeeding generation of Southwark vestrymen. The incident, isolated as it was, may be explained by local circumstances - the persistence of conservative feeling carried over from the previous reign, or an underlying dissatisfaction with the minister who was an 'old man' of sixty-five years.[3]

Shortly afterwards, came the Queen's letter to Parker complaining of the diversities apparent in clerical garb and the form of church services.[4] Parker's 1564 policy of a settlement by negotiation with Thomas Sampson and Lawrence Humphrey, the

---

1. LCCRO. VM. p.49.
2. SP. i, 52.
3. Kelly was given £4 on his departure "...bycawse that he ys an olde man". (VM. p.50).
4. It was written on 25 January, 1565. See Parker Corr., 223 for the text, which is quoted in extenso by Dixon, op.cit. vi, 44-6. An earlier, more restrained letter in November had aroused no response.

national leaders of the nonconformists, was cut short by this forthright expression of royal disapproval. Orders were issued to the bishop to inquire and certify of the state of uniformity in their dioceses.[1] The Book of Advertisements was drawn up, rationalising the archbishop's attitude, and particularising the details of a uniform garb and service, and Sampson, Humphrey, and four London ministers were called before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and later the privy council itself.[2] The names of these Londoners are not known, but these meetings give the first direct evidence of the identification of the City radicals with the academic nonconformists.

This is confirmed by the letter sent to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners shortly after the examination of March 3rd., attempting to justify the objections to the surplice and at the same time pleading for lenient treatment of the Puritan leaders. Seventeen ministers subscribed to it, apart from Sampson and Humphrey. Among these were the dean of St. Paul's, the archdeacons of London and Essex, the master of Savoy College in the Strand, six incumbents of London livings, a City curate, a lecturer, a chaplain of Grindal who held an Essex benefice, and

---

1. The returns are unfortunately not extant for London diocese.
2. cf. Knappen, op.cit. 192-4 for details of these meetings.
3. St. Paul's Cathedral MS. Addit. 1, "Epistolae virorum doctorum de rebus Ecclesiasticis tempore Elizabethae Reginae", no. 119. An unsigned copy exists in Lansd. MS. 8, 8, ff.17-8, and is printed in Strype, Parker, iii, 95-7. I owe the reference to the original letter to Dr. P. Collinson.

John Fox, the martyrologist, who although he held no parochial appointment, often ventured out of the Duke of Norfolk's London house to preach in parish churches.[1] Only five of the subscribers had no official connection with London, although they had all preached at Paul's Cross or at the Spital.[2] Of the fourteen directly associated with the City, ten had been Marian exiles, including four out of the eight who held parochial appointments there.[3] The other four were Grindalian ordinands, two of them being his chaplains.[4]

The names appended to this letter offer striking proof of the strength of the contingent of former exiles in the nonconformist revolt at this time; only three of the signatories are not known to have been on the continent before 1559. Also worthy of note is the persistence of radical views in the London administrative hierarchy even at this date some months after the Queen had expressed her displeasure at the lack of uniformity. Two archdeacons of the diocese, and another designate, were among the subscribers, as was the dean of St. Paul's. There was little prospect of the enforcement of

---

1. The full list was: Whittingham (dean of Durham); Sampson; Humphrey; Thomas Cole; Alvey (master of Savoy College); Gough; Crowley; Porrage, Wiburn; Philpot; Fox; Allen; Mullins; Calfhill Lever; Nowell; Laugher (Langhorne); Kervey (Carvell); and Freake (later bishop of Rochester etc.). For Fox's activities at this time, see J.F.Mozley, John Foxe and His Book (1940), 62-95.
2. Whittingham, Sampson, Humphrey, Lever, Freake.
3. The exceptions were Gough, Philpot, Allen, and Calfhill.
4. Philpot and Calfhill.

discipline, as Parker came to realise, by administrators who were themselves prominent in the nonconformist ranks.

There was no immediate possibility, however, of Parker utilising the Ecclesiastical Commission to overide diocesan authority. His first steps were to educate by example, by the punishment of the established leaders, Sampson and Humphrey. At the same time he still held out a hope that Grindal, if stirred by the pressure of a royal letter, might put his own house in order, a suggestion which he made to Cecil.[1] His optimism was quickly dampened by Elizabeth's characteristic reluctance to involve herself directly in the execution of an unpopular policy; her failure to authorise the archbishop's Advertisements or to bring pressure on Grindal, temporarily disheartened him, but did not diminish his determination to take strong action. A phrase in a letter to Cecil in April 1565 that Sampson and Humphrey should have been "...peremptorily, at the first, put to the choice, either conformity or depart,"[2] suggests the growing inflexibility of his attitude.

Isolated action against offenders in London was apparently being taken in the spring of 1565, but it is not clear whether the initiative lay with the bishop or with Parker. The first incumbent to be deprived from his living 'for the surplice' was one Brokelsby, deposed in early April.[3] This may have been the

---

1. Corr. 233-4.
2. Ibid. 240.
3. SP. 1,52. But cf. Knappen, op.cit. 193. As we have seen, Kelly was ejected from his curacy three months earlier.

Humphrey Brokelsby who was known to be in charge of the vacant living of St. Nicholas Olave in 1561.[1] Grindal rather offset the value of this preliminary blow by permitting the appointment of Humphrey and Sampson to preach the Easter sermons at Paul's Cross.[2] Sampson had been for years a popular choice,[3] but his approval at a time when he was under close interrogation by the archbishop, suggested a lack of sympathy on the part of Grindal for Parker's policy that was in keeping with his earlier attitude.

The episcopal visitation of May 1565 was a crucial test of Grindal's willingness to apply the policy, that Parker had attempted to impose on the intellectual leaders of the resistance, on the mass of the parish clergy. Until then there was nothing in his actions, - with the possible exception of the Brokelsby case -, to suggest that he was prepared to enforce conformity even at the price of deprivation, or to alter the archbishop's recent opinion that "...My Lord of London is their own, they say, and is but brought in against his will".[4]

Details of the visitation, which was overlooked by Dixon and Knappen, are sparse, and it is not possible to calculate how

---

1. Lambeth MS. Tension 711, No.19. This document is mis-dated 1563; it is in fact a copy of the 1561 certificate in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MS. 112, pp. 78-9).
2. Parker's Corr., 239-40.
3. Machyn, op.cit. 192, 231, 280.
4. Parker to Cecil, April 7th, 1565 (Corr. 237)

completely Grindal based his enquiries on the orders laid down in the Book of Advertisements, as became the practice later.[1] It is known, however, that he issued injunctions enforcing the use of the surplice in the administration of the sacraments and in public prayer, and that he was concerned with the licensing of preachers.[2] This latter order was in no way an innovation, - indeed, Grindal as early as 1561 had taken action against a City incumbent for this offence[3] -, but its topicality in 1565 lay in its identification with vestiarian uniformity as the principal platform of Anglican policy. This had been made clear by Parker's letter of 12 May, immediately prior to the visitation, instructing Grindal to call in all preaching licences dated before April 1, 1565 on account of the activities of "...divers undiscreet preachers...[which] have deceived our expectations", and to make henceforth "...a more deligent choice of such as shall sue for such licences".[4] This regulation not only, as Knappen put it, "...clipped the wings of the wandering exhorters,"[5] but was also intended to check the propagandist activities of radical incumbents.

Thus armed, and encouraged perhaps by the belated

---

1. Although publication of the Advertisements was delayed until March 28/1566 (because of vain efforts made to obtain royal endorsement), the archbishop's policy from March 1565 onwards was based on the regulations then laid down.
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.116r.
3. Ibid. f.45r.
4. Corr. 242.
5. Knappen, op.cit. 193.

deprivation of Sampson and Humphrey, Grindal took determined action against the more headstrong of the London radicals. One, minister of St. Bartholomew Less, was suspended in the visitation session held on May 15, but died before his case was settled.[1] Three others, two of them assistant curates and the third a perpetual curate, were brought before the bishop on July 11 for failing to observe the injunctions laid down at the visitation. Most prominent was Nicholas Standen, curate of St. Margaret Pattens. He admitted both to inveighing against the surplice which "...serued for no decentsye but for disguisynge," and to preaching without a licence, saying "...that he reedeth not of suche order used in the prymatyve churches and therefore myght preach without lycence."[2] This may well have been the first occasion that this argument, which later became a stock Puritan answer, was employed by an Elizabethan nonconformist.[3] Standen was suspended, and after showing further defiance, was ordered to appear before the royal commissioners on the following day. His two colleagues, although just as adamant, were less vehement, and were told to deliberate further on the matter and make another appearance before the ordinary.[4]

No record of later proceedings survives, but it does not

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.110r.
2. Ibid. f.116r.
3. cf. James Stile, R. of St. Margaret Lothbury, in the visitation of 1574 (GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.]).
4. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.116v.

appear that Sinclair and Bucberd, the less headstrong couple, suffered more than a temporary suspension, if that.[1] As for Standen, a few months later he was instituted to the same benefice where, as a curate, he had refused the surplice.[2] Despite the negative result produced, however, these proceedings show that Grindal was at this time participating more actively in the archbishop's policy of vestiarian uniformity than might be gathered from Parker's recent complaints.[3]

Events in London were coming to a head. In this perspective, Grindal's unexpected efforts to effect a compromise in early 1566 is of some significance, marking a reaction from his own policy of the previous summer, and reflecting the dilemma of a man, who, with one foot in either camp, still hoped for a rapprochement between two attitudes made irreconcilable by Parker's coup de grâce of Sampson and Humphrey.

This compromise was arranged at a meeting of the London ministers before the bishop and his archdeacon at St. Sepulchre

---

1. Sinclair remained minister till 1566; Bucberd was still curate at St. Olave Hart Street in 1567 (see Appendix B).
2. Henn. 287.
3. cf. Dixon, op.cit.,vi, 119. "The Bishop of London was not altogether so inactive as Parker held him to be; but seems to have taken a somewhat independent course out of sympathy with the Nonconformists, or tenderness, or preferring to work through his ordinary jurisdiction."

on February 3rd, 1566.[1] According to Earl, this meeting followed shortly after the archdeacon's visitation of January, when "A stur [was made] for squar capp and surplys and gown/ and subscribinge."[2] Nothing is known of the response to these injunctions, but Grindal's intervention may have been intended to avert a deadlock resulting from clerical intransigence on these points. Grindal seized on the possibility of a negotiated settlement on terms acceptable to the radicals: a hundred and one out of the hundred and nine clerics present subscribed to his proposal "...to take over them the Round capp with a deyp nécke the fforme of a turkey gown/ with a fallung cape /", amd to wear "...in church mynestering the syrplyce only". Of the eight who refused, all "...had sayed Mass in quene Maryes dayes and wold not chaunge theyre habytts of old patterne."[3] Grindal's concessions on the form of the cap and the use of a cope apparently reconciled the radicals to the surplice in the administration of the sacraments.[4] Opposition came from among

---

1. Earl is the sole source for this meeting (CUL.MS.Mm,1,29,f.2v He records the date as 3 Feb.,1565 which Strype interpreted as early 1564 (Grindal,144). Dixon (op.cit.vi,120) followed Strype with reservations, but Knappen (op.cit.196) had no qualms in forwarding the year, but dated it on February 1st. Earl's consistent ante-dating by a year of the meetings held at this time, as well as the extreme likelihood of such proceedings in early 1565, - before Parker had commenced proceedings against Sampson and Humphrey -, appear conclusively to bear out Knappen's dating.
2. CUL. MS. Mm, 1,29, f.45v. Earl dates it January 1565.
3. Ibid, f.2v.
4. cf. Dixon, op.cit. vi, 120. The 'round cap' decision marked a swift retreat from the archdeacon's order a few weeks earlier.

the pre-Elizabethan ordinands, and was a conservative reaction of type familiar in an ideological situation of this kind: it was apparently unchallenged by the authorities, for no disciplinary action was taken against the non-iurats.[1] The overwhelming support given to the proposals was a triumph for Grindal's diplomacy; indeed, perhaps he alone, with his long-established sympathetic relationship with the parish clergy, could have achieved it.

It was a Pyrrhic victory. Parker had based his policy of vestiarian uniformity on the regulations laid down in the Book of Advertisements, and he could accept no compromise. He tried in vain to secure royal sanction for these ordinances, but in spite of his complaint of the lack of support for his policy, it is clear from his letter to Cecil on March 12, 1566 that he was deliberating whether to act personally in London through the Ecclesiastical Commission, and override diocesan authority. "I have written and written oft," he declared impatiently to Cecil, "that a few in London rule over this matter." He had already intervened in the selection of the Spital preachers for the following Easter, and had rejected two of the names suggested by the Lord Mayor, "...[for] I dare not adventure to commend them for conformable."[2] He was still hesitant, however, of the

---

1. Although their names are not known, it is possible to identify pre-Elizabethan ordinands; none of these suffered any form of suspension or sequestration at this time.
2. Thomas Cole and Thomas Penny, both of whom held prebends in St. Paul's (Henn. 41,48).

legality of an outright policy of mass deprivation.[1]

Parker's scruples had vanished by March 20. Not only was he reassured on the legal issue, but he had succeeded in drawing in Grindal into joint-responsibility for a policy which two months earlier the bishop had side-stepped. This sudden volte-face must have been the result of heavy pressure, from a superior authority. In a joint letter to Cecil, Parker and Grindal described their intentions: the London clergy - "all manner of pastors and curates" - were to be summoned to Lambeth where they would be first warned en masse to "...promise conformity in their ministrations and outward apparel...", and then asked to subscribe individually. Those who refused were to be suspended forthwith, their livings sequestered, and if they were still unreconciled within three months, they were to be deprived. The writers were fully aware of the consequences of these drastic measures, and did not attempt to belittle the extent of the opposition that was expected: a gloomy forecast was made of destitute City churches, jobless clerics, and of the "tumult...speeches and talks [that] be like to rise in the realm and presently the whole city..." In view of the controversy anticipated, the attendance of members of the privy council at the meeting was implored, in order to provide that royal sanction for Parker's policy which he had for so long

---

1. Corr. 263-4.

invoked in vain.[1]

Although this appeal for influential lay support was unsuccessful,[2] the Lambeth meeting, which finally took place on March 26, 1566, turned out much as had been anticipated. Incumbents, curates and lecturers serving in the City, including those of the archbishop's peculiars and the four Southwark livings in the diocese of Winchester, were cited.[3] Nine or ten (including Coverdale who excused himself)[4] failed to make an appearance, so that a total of ninety-eight clerics was present

---

1. Ibid. 267-9.
2. Dixon (op.cit. vi, 95, note), was convinced that "no lay person of honour was there". A correspondent in 1567 named Parker, Grindal, the dean of Westminster, "and some canonists", e present. (Zurich Letters, ii, 148).
3. Some doubt exists about the liability of lecturers to attend According to Thomas Wood, clerics with no 'spirituall lyvings' were not cited (Herts.Rec.Office Gorhambury MS.viii/8/143), but at least two of those suspended are known to have been parish lecturers who held no other ministerial office (Bartlett, Allen) Wood may have been thinking of those unattached preachers, newly recruited to London (such as John Field), whom Parker examined in April (Corr. 278), and who had presumably arrived too late to be cited to the Lambeth meeting.
4. Remains of Myles Coverdale, ed. G.Pearson, Parker Soc. (1846 532. He pleaded ill-health and 'other considerations'.

to hear Parker's ultimatum.[1] According to a participant, they were asked to subscribe to the observance of the Book of Common Prayer, and to wear "...the schollers Gown / and capp / [and] the syrplys at all sarvyes."[2] One of their number appeared as a mannequin in the prescribed garb.[3] Parker allowed no time for deliberation or debate; the thirty-seven clerics who could not accept these terms, were suspended forthwith and the fruits of their livings sequestered. Amongst them "...were the best, and some preachers; six or seven convenient sober men, pretending a conscience, divers of them but zealous, and of little learning and judgement."[4] This mass resistance was the most important ac of overt regional defiance of its policy that had yet confronted the Elizabethan ecclesiastical authorities; it was the clearest

---

1. These were Parker's figures (Corr.270). Wood's total was 36. (Gorhambury MS. viii/B/143). Earl, who ante-dated the meeting t 24 March, 1565, gave the attendance total as 140, of whom 30 did not subscribe. (f.1v.). This has led to some confusion, both i dates and figures, Strype wrongly reported two Lambeth meetings one in 1564, and the other in 1566, and gave Earl's figures for the former and Parker's for the latter (Grindal, 144-5, 154). The VCH.(309) followed Strype, but Knappen (op.cit. 196-7) wisely relied entirely on Parker's account. Stow, in his detailed memoranda of the 1563-66 events, makes no reference to a 1564 mass subscription. This confusion can be traced back to Earl's unreliability in his dates and figures (his notebook was compiled nearly forty years later), which led Strype to record what was an entirely fictitious meeting in 1564.
2. CUL. MS.Mm,1,29, f.3r. Strype (Grindal, 145-6), wrote an expanded version of Earl's account of the meeting.
3. This was Robert Coles, a former exile. He was rewarded with the living of All Hallows Bread St..
4. Parker's Corr. 270.

expression yet revealed of the deeply-embedded roots of radical nonconformity in early Elizabethan London, an area whose allegiance to the establishment was regarded by contemporaries as indispensable for the well-being of the Anglican church. As the Bishop ofEly put it, "If London were reformed, all the realm would soon follow".[1]

It remained to be seen how long the spontaneous defiance at Lambeth could be sustained in the face of economic and spiritual sanctions. Earl, who shared in the ministerial affliction, recorded how "...we are kylled in the soule of our soules for this pollutyon of yours, for that wee can not performe yt yn the syngleness of our harts this our mynisterye / so we Abyd in most extreme mysery our wyves and Babbes / By the Bishops whoe oppress us..."[2] Nonconformist solidarity, backed by outbreaks of popular demonstrations, could yet force Parker to make concessions. Here, the archbishop was handicapped by his tactical error in presenting his ultimatum shortly before Easter the busiest time in the clerical year.[3] The frustration of parishioners of a destitute church was not infrequently diverted into anti-hierarchical demonstrations of some effect with privy councillors who found little favour for Parker's actions. Cecil himself inquired anxiously of the archbishop of the accuracy of

---

1. Ibid. 270.
2. CUL. MS.Mm,1,29, f.3v.
3. Easter Sunday fell on April 14, less than three weeks after the Lambeth meeting.

of reports "[that] there were six hundred persons ready to the communion, and came into a church, and found the doors shut." Parker reassured him on the familiar lines of ex musca elaphantem, and with a reminder that he had earlier warned him of the probability of popular disturbances.[1] In the light of persistent City disorders, this could hardly have reassured the government. Ward administrative officials assisted the suspended vicar of St. Giles Cripplegate in repulsing surpliced parish clerks from entering his church.[2] A conformist preacher in St. Margaret Pattens was stoned, dragged from the pulpit, and scratched in the face by 'certain wives' in the congregation;[3] a similar brawl developed in the church of All Hallows the Less, mainly, it seems, because the conformable minister was seen to be smiling sceptically at the views of a nonconformist preacher.[4] Grindal was embarrassed by a deputation of sixty women who came to him on behalf of a suspended lecturer; "much misliking such kind of assembling," he wrote plaintively to Cecil, "[I] willed them to send me half a dozen of their husbands and with them I would talk."[5]

The radical cause was well publicised by these incidents,

---

1. Corr. 277.
2. Ibid. 276.
3. Stow, Chronicles, 135.
4. Ibid. 138. For similar scenes, see ibid. 136,138,140.
5. Remains, 288-9. London wives appear to have had a particularly vicious vendetta against Grindal (See Stow op cit. 140).

and by the sermons of suspended ministers who preached in defiance of their inhibition.[1] Nor was there any lack of privat preasure on the government by influential laymen. Thomas Wood a London merchant, whose sympathy with the nonconformists could be traced back to his association with Whittingham in Frankfort and Geneva,[2] protested violently to Cecil, and laid particular emphasis on the spiritual gap left in the City by the prohibition of"...excersises of interpretation of the scripture used every morning and evening in Sundry churches within this City..."[3] His suggestion that Cecil himself was chiefly responsible for "this present calamity" was a misrepresentation of what in fact was largely Parker's personal policy at the Queen's behest.[4] More effective for the ministers' cause was the literary campaign that the controversy aroused. Here, the radicals benefited from the pamphleteering experience of Crowley, who had been a stationer in the reign of Edward VI, and

---

1. So recalcitrant were some of these ministers that the authorities were forced to confine them to their own homes, e.g. Crowley, Bartlett (Parker Corr. 276). Stow testifies to their defiance - "In sume placis ye mynystars themselves dyd servyse in theyr gownes or clokes with tunyng colars and hatts as they werwont to do, and preched stowtly and agaynst ye ordar taken by ye quene and counsell and ye byshopps for consentynge ther unto..." (Chronicles, 135,138).
2. Garrett, op.cit. 343.
3. Herts. Rec. Office, MS. Gorhambury viii/B/143.
4. Parker, in a letter to Cecil on April 12, described a significant interview with the Queen on March 10. "I answered, that these precise folk would offer their goods and bodies to prison rather than they would relent. And her Highness willed me to imprison them." (Corr. 278).

whose literary technique had developed in Latimer's heyday. An unprinted paper stating the reasons for refusing the apparel, appears to have been drawn up by the nonconformists either at the Lambeth meeting, or directly afterwards, and delivered to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners,[1] but their first important apologia was Crowley's "A brief Discourse against the outward apparel and ministering garments of the Popish Church', which, according to Dixon, was the first 'manifest' expression of Nonconformity.[2] Admittedly 'indifferent' matters in themselves, Crowley wrote, the risk of idolatry on 'simple Christians' did not justify the retention of the 'outward apparel', for which there was no scriptural authority. Even at the cost of incurrin royal displeasure, "we utterly refuse to showe our conformity... and yett willing to submit ourselves to suffer whatsoever punishment the Lawes doe appoint in this case".[3] This publication was damaging enough to bring out an official reply which dwelt on the educational shortcomings of the non-subscribers,[4] (this brought a ready answer, also probably from Crowley's pen),[5] and it was also directly responsible for the

---

1. Dixon, op.cit. vi, 96. Another protest was 'The Voice of God' by Towers, a coalman and 'smaterar in mysyke', scorned by Stow. (Chronicles, 139).
2. op.cit. vi, 115. The composition of Crowley's work owed much to the "...wholl myltytud of London mynystars, every one of them gyvynge theyr advyce in wrytynge..." (Stow, op.cit.139)
3. The pamphlet was disseminated amongst Londoners at "theyr mornynge congratyn" (Stow, op.cit. 139), that is, at the morning lectures or exercises.
4. "A Brief Examination for the Tyme of a Certaine Declaration Lately Put in Print - written by Parker or one of his assistants
5. An Answere for the Tyme to the Examination put in Print (156

tightening of the regulations concerning the printing of books.[1]

Neither Crowley's leadership nor the encouragement of Puritan leaders elsewhere could keep together the London group. A novel form of passive resistance[2] was small compensation for the loss of a hard-earned living. As early as March 28, 1566, Parker was able to report to Cecil that - "Some of these silly recusants say now they thought not that ever the matter (in such scarcity of ministers) shuld have been forced, and some begin to repent; and one of them was with me this day to be admitted again to his parish, and now promiseth conformity..."[3] Suspension was relaxed on the acknowledgement of parochial sureties for conformable behaviour. Not one nonconformist minister remained in the deanery of Arches by the middle of April.[4] Elsewhere, although the archbishop was still perturbed by Grindal's lack of determination, the flow of unconditional submissions turned the Puritan resistance into a semi-rout. Parker himself examined the churchwardens of many of the London parishes on April 11, and also "...talked with new coming preachers to London, moving to sedition, and have charged them

---

1. Knappen, op.cit. 199-200.
2. cf. Ibid. 199.
3. Corr. 272.
4. Ibid. 278.

to silence. I have some in prison..."[1] Thomas Earl, after lamenting "...the Inconstanty of men in tryall", himself yielded in the summer of 1566, because, as he put it, "the Byshopes consecrated quisque and quibuscunque / to place in our Romthes."[2]

The policy of appointing chaplains and other available ministers to serve the cures of suspended ministers was both an inducement to the submission of the latter, and a palliative to lay complaints of the destitute state of City churches.[3] Another explanation of the collapse of the resistance lay, according to Earl, in the rewards offered in the form of another living; Robert Coles, who had at one time risked his life in preaching to the secret Protestant congregation in Marian London Henry Bedell, and William Clark, all received preferment as a result of their submission.[4] The majority of the early nonconformists were not, however, important enough to be bribed.

---

1. Ibid. 278. Some of these 'new coming' preachers had been maintaining the St. Antholin lectures since the suspension of the three regular preachers, Crowley, Gough, and Philpot. (MS. Gorhambury viii/B/143). Was John Field among them? He was ordained priest by Grindal on March 25, 1566, commencing his priestly career at the height of the vestiarian crisis. (GLMS. 9535/1, f.124v.).
2. CUL. MS.Mm,1,29, f.1v.
3. Grindal, who had 'vacant priests' as well as chaplains available, answered Parker on April 12 that only preachers were required in those churches within his jurisdiction. (Parker Corr. 278).
4. CUL.MS.Mm,1,29, f.1v. Presumably, they were granted reversionary presentations, for it was not until 1568-9 that they obtained further benefices: Coles was collated by the archbishop to the rectory of All Hallows Bread St. (Henn.76), and Clark to All Hallows the Great (ibid.84). (For Bedell, ibid. 125

Parker's terms were categorical, and it was their realisation that his intentions were more than vague threats that made his policy so effective. He himself felt he had little to lose, - "For as the most part of these recusants, I would wish them out of the ministry, as mere ignorant and vain heads"[1] -, whereas in many cases his opponents were forfeiting positions which they had long struggled to obtain, and for which there was no adequate substitution. Earl, who described how the suspensions "...made they [ministers] there wyves and children most mysrable poore / and woffull parson"[2], was himself in danger of losing a living which he had only secured after five years as assistant curate, and a livelihood for which, at the age of forty-seven, there could be few alternatives. John Johnson could preach against the 'Popish rags'[3], but could not forfeit the living for which he had waited six years. Even William Porrage, of sufficient eminence in the nonconformist ranks to ~~be a signee~~ have signed. the letter of March 20th, 1565, eventually subscribed, as did James Calfhill and Thomas Beacon, although probably for

---

1. Corr. 272.
2. CUL. MS.Mm,1,29,f.2r.
3. SP. i, 156-7 (undated).

different reasons.[1]

Suspension, sequestration of revenues, and the threat of deprivation were still effective disciplinary sanctions. By July 1566, when the three months notice of deprivation expired, not more than eight London incumbents, three lecturers, and three or possibly four curates, were prepared, in Crowley's proud words of May, "...to suffer at man's hand whatsoever punishments man's laws do appoint...but our consciences we keep in the sight of Him that shall judge all men."[2] The eight parsons were deprived from their London benefices, and, accordin to arrangements already made by Parker, notification was sent tc the patrons of the livings to present their successors.[3] Those ejected were Crowley, who, with the loss of two City livings, a prebend in St. Paul's, and the archdiaconal dignity of Hereford, received the harshest treatment of all; Philpot and Gough; the firebrands Wiburn and Standen, neither of whom was to hold a similar pastoral office again, and the lesser known figures,

---

1. Beacon was an old man (he died the following year) to whom security may have been all-important. (For another interpretation see D.S.Bailey, Thomas Beacon and the Reformation of the Church in England.,(1952), 102. "He felt it right at the time to withhold his subscription, but later, having considered the matter and understanding that no question of principle was involved, he did not hesitate to submit."). More unexpected was the transformation of Calfhill from the anti-vestiarian of the 1563 Convocation, and the outspoken Court preacher of 1564, to an apparent conformist in 1566 who not only kept all his preferments but was later nominated to the bishopric of Worcester (DNB.).
2. A briefe discourse, Sig.Biii,f.1v.
3. Corr. 274.

Lithall, Sheriff, and Sinclair.[1] Unbeneficed ministers known to have been removed were the lecturers Allen, Bartlett, and Gressop,[2] and very likely, three clerics who appear to have been attached to parishes as curates, Martin, Brown, and the Scotsman John Baron.[3]

It remains to estimate the significance of the vestiarian controversy on the future development of clerical nonconformity in London. First, what was the extent of the loss incurred by the deprivations above mentioned? They represented the hard core of organised Puritanism, and with their removal from influential parish positions, the movement suffered an irreparable loss. Of the eight deprived incumbents, only Crowley managed eventually to re-establish himself among the London parish clergy.[4] Philpot and Lithall were able to retain

---

1. Henn. noted the deprivation of Philpot (332), Gough (375), Wiburn (383), Standen (287), Lithall (282), and Sheriff (86), although in most instances he post-dated the precise time by a year or more (His criterion was the date of the subsequent institution, regardless of any interval of vacancy). Parker recounted Crowley's fate, (Corr.276), but there is no official reference to Sinclair's (Seyntclere) ejection. I have included him because of his known nonconformity in 1565, and because it is clear from the parish records of his cure (All Hallows Staining) that he was replaced in 1566. (cf. Appendix A).
2. Allen and Gressop are named by Earl, and Bartlett by Grindal (Remains, 288). Mozley surmises that John Fox was amongst the non-subscribers (op.cit.76).
3. Browne was certainly ejected from St. Mary Aldermanbury (see Appendix A). Baron and Martin were named in a precept demanding the arrest of unlicensed preachers in the following year (LCRO. Journals, 19, f.48r.).
4. Henn. 267.

or obtain country livings,[1] but were permanently lost to London. Sheriff was said to have forsaken the ministry altogether,[2] while the remaining four took up extreme positions on the left-wing fringe of the established church. Standen and Sinclair were among the founder members of the London classical movement; Gough was at the least a fellow traveller,[3] and Wiburn seems to have severed his connection with London altogether, and occupied himself as a domestic chaplain to noble patrons.[4]

No longer could the policy of ecclesiastical reform be advocated from the relative security of a nucleus of City parsonages; no longer did it find expression in the cohesive strength of a compact body of beneficed clergymen. Puritan proselytism became a hazardous activity on the part of individual ministers who could no longer depend on the forbearance of the authorities. Consequently, the movement became increasingly diverted away from the sphere of its previous strength, the parsonage. Radicalism was henceforth to find its strength in parish lectureships, voluntary ad hoc establishments dependent on the contributions of parishioners, and with none of the tenural security of a freehold incumbency. The more extreme

---

1. Stow, (op.cit.140) wrongly stated that Philpot did not lose his City living. He partially subscribed in order to retain his Stepney benefice, and was also given the living of Rye in Kent (ibid. 140). Lithall eventually obtained the vicarage of Newport in Essex.
2. CUL.MS.Mm, 1,39,f.2r.
3. cf. Knappen, op.cit. 230.
4. DNB.

reformers, frustrated by their inability to work from positions within the framework of the established church, were to plan internal reform through clandestine organisations of 'classical' cells, or, rejecting outright the concept of Anglicanism, were to develop their own forms of separatism. The later careers of the deprived clerics bring out the close connection between Parker's actions on March 26, 1566, and the emergence of these movements in London.

This was the price paid by the archbishop for his undermining of the nonconformist nucleus. In so far as the future conformability of the mass of the parish clergy was concerned, the price was well-justified. 1566 saw, in the first place, the demise of the 'exile' party as an active pressure group: two of their most prominent members, Crowley and Wiburn, were deprived, and a third, Coverdale, appears to have resigned his living to avoid this indignity. John Fox, may have lost his preaching position, while Walter Kelly was removed from his curacy in Southwark. Of the seven remaining survivors in City cures, two (possibly three) are known to have hesitated before accepting Parker's terms,[1] but all eventually conformed.

Secondly, Parker and Grindal contrived to substitute for this group a nucleus of loyalists dependent on ecclesiastical

---

1. Beacon and Porrage. A third may have been Langhorne of whose activity at this date there is no information whatsoever. (See Appendix A.).

patrons for preferment, and themselves not inferior in quality to their predecessors. Coverdale, for instance, was succeeded by John Young, a distinguished preacher who was to become the bishop of Rochester.[1] Wiburn's living was given to William Gravett, later one of Aylmer's chaplains, and Philpot was replaced by another long-lived loyalist, Richard Matthew.[2] Bartholomew Busfield obtained the rectory of St. Christopher le Stocks; John Bullingham, later bishop of Gloucester, that of St. Mary Magdalene Milk St.; Thomas Drant the vicarage of St. Giles Cripplegate, and Thomas Mortibois, the small benefice of St. Alphage, vacant by the deprivation of Sheriff.[3] The only newcomer known to express any sympathy for the Puritan cause was Robert Porder who replaced Gough at St. Peter Cornhill.[4] They were all graduates and active preachers whose orthodoxy, - with the possible exception of Porder -, was unimpeachable. At least five of the newcomers owed their preferment to the bishop,[5] and those collated by the dean and chapter of St. Paul's may also have been influenced by his nomination. The patron of former emigrés and youthful iconoclasts had been lost, - temporarily at least -, in the calamity of 1566 for which he was

---

1. Henn. 274.
2. Ibid. 383, 332.
3. Ibid. 282, 268, 172, 86.
4. Ibid. 275.
5. i.e. Young, Busfield, ~~Sheriff~~ Mortibois (all collations), Gravett and Porder (nominations). Bullingham and Drant were collated by the dean and chapter of St. Paul's, and Mathew was presented by the Drapers' Company.

not least responsible.

These replacements did much to set up a reputation for the ecclesiastical establishment which few of the orthodox clergy of 1560-66 had enhanced by their own example. More specifically the preaching popularity hitherto enjoyed by nonconformists, - whether they be 'outsiders' like Sampson, Whitehead, or Turner, or City incumbents like Crowley, Gough, and Philpot -, both in public positions at Paul's Cross and the Spital, and in parish lectureships, Sunday pulpits, and funeral services,[1] could now be diverted into channels approved by official Anglican policy. The contrast in the composition of Paul's Cross preachers, and the views they expressed, immediately pre - and post - March 1566, illustrates the change.[2] Of twenty sermons recorded between June 1565 and 3 March 1566, nine were delivered by eight of the signees of the anti-vestiarian supplication of 20 March 1565;[3] two others were given by known sympathisers,[4] and at least

---

1. Machyn (op.cit.192 et seq.)records a number of Paul's Cross commemorative, and funeral sermons between 1559-1563 which indicate the popularity of the radical preachers. The highest total was that of Veron (11 + 1 at Court). Others included Sampson (4 + 2 at Court); Beacon (3); Coverdale (6); Gough (2); Philpot (2); Turner (3); Crowley (8); West (2). Only the bishops, Jewel, Grindal, and Horne, approached the totals of Veron and Crowley.
2. Bodl. MS. Tanner 50, 10. These sermons were taken down in summary form by a member of the congregation. A few were delivered not at the Cross but within St. Paul's. Occasionally a Sunday was omitted, so that this is not a complete record of Paul's Cross sermons during this period.
3. Crowley, Lever, Cole (2), Freke, Gough, Nowell, Calfhill, Carvell.
4. Turner (dean of Well, deprived in 1566); Willock (moderator of the Scottish general assembly).

three of the remaining eight were preached by men who did not attempt to conceal their antipathy to the 'Popish relics' that remained in the church.[1] Only the Provost of Eton's sermon on 3 February 1566 on the theme of obedience to the prince (Romans, Ch. XIII) could be interpreted as a direct apologia for current ecclesiastical policy.[2]

By contrast, the appointments between 10 March - November 1566 were dominated by official spokesmen,[3] and parish clergy who had subscribed to Parker's orders.[4] Only three of the pre-March selections were re-appointed for this period,[5] and Nowell was the sole survivor of the subscribers to Sampson's letter. Few dared to condemn the nonconformists outright before a congregation of some thousands of citizens; rather, they appealed for unity "... in this controversy amongest vs, (you know what I do mean)".[6] Sermons were non-controversial by comparison with those of the preceding period, an exception being that of a former emigré who prayed that the Queen would not "...prescribe and lymit vnto

---

1. Bullingham (two sermons) criticised the system of regulated prayers that existed in the church. (f.21r.) Sanderson attacked superstitions that still persisted in country churches (f.37r and v.).
2. Ibid. f.39r. and v.
3. e.g. Day (Provost of Eton); Bridges (later bishop); Overton (later bishop); Horne (bishop of Winchester).
4. Young (Rector of St. Martin Ludgate); Henry Wright (R. of St. Stephen Walbrook); Palmer (V. of St. Lawrence Jewry); Gravett (V. of St. Sepulchre); Bullingham (R. of St. Mary Magdalene Milk St.).
5. Day, Nowell, Bullingham.
6. Gravett (ibid. f.66v.).

ye preachers what they shall say, but let them speke ffrely...

for to prescribe to them is to prescribe vnto gods embassadours ...[1]"

1. David Pady, chaplain to the bishop of Winchester (ibid. f.78r.). Later in the sermon, however, he declared he objected to any criticism of authority (f.83r.). Eggram (ff.84r.-87v.) and Day (ff.50v.-53v.) dealt critically with topical problems on the state of the ministry.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CLERICAL NONCONFORMITY (II).

(1) THE POLARISATION OF PURITANISM 1567-70.

Radical feeling among the beneficed clergy was for several years subdued following Parker's purge in 1566. The intransigent nonconformists had been ejected. Some of the more important waverers had succumbed to the prospect of further preferment, while their humbler colleagues, like Thomas Earl, had apparently reconciled themselves to the view that the wearing of the habits was a 'thing indifferent'. Their defection was only partially compensated by the infiltration of newcomers into London incumbencies. Some of these were considered promising assets to the radical ranks. William Wager, who, declared Thomas Wilcox, "...hath many tymes bin whot in wordes against the Popish Regiment and Ceremonies",[1] was collated to the rectory of St. Benet Gracechurch by the dean and chapter of St. Paul's in 1567.[2] John Presse, who first came to a London cure in 1570, was a product of Peterhouse college, the nursery of so many Puritans in the 1560s.[3] Thomas Edwards, collated to the rectory of St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street in 1571, was already well-

---

1. CUL. MS. Mm,1,43, p.442.
2. Henn. 79.
3. Alumni Cantab. 1,iii,392.

established radical preacher in the capital.[1] William Davies, vicar of St. Olave Jewry in 1570, was another mild Puritan, despite his non-preaching status.[2]

Their combined activity at this time, however, caused little alarm to the ecclesiastical authorities. Only very rarely was Grindal obliged to start disciplinary proceedings against beneficed ministers. Thomas Jenkinson and William Scotson were excommunicated in 1567 for failing to appear in the consistory court to answer certain charges which may possibly have been connected with nonconformity.[3] John Scarlet, rector of St. Bartholomew Exchange, was suspended by the vicar general for refusing to wear the surplice and the square cap, but submitted on the same day.[4]

If this period was one of outward quiescence among the beneficed clergy, it was marked by feverish activity in the 'wings' of the established church, the parish lectureships, and the semi-separatist congregations in the capital. The recrudescence of the private conventicle, dormant since the first year of the reign, was a by-product of the vestiarian controversy. John Smith, a member of the Plumber's Hall congregation detected in 1567, testified to the circumstantial

---

1. Ralph Adamson, a clothworker of St. Nicholas Acon, left money for four sermons to be preached by Edmunds 'lately our Minister' in 1571. (GLMS. 9171/16, f.78r.).
2. SP.1,22.
3. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.171v.
4. Ibid, f.173v.

character of early separatism. Its cause lay in Parker's enforcement of uniformity of worship among the parish clergy; its inspiration was the recollection of "...a congregation of us in this city in Queen Mary's day; and a congregation at Geneva, which used a book and order of preaching, ministering of the sacraments and discipline, most agreeable to the word of God..."[1]

Several such separatist congregations existed in London between 1567-70. Many individuals in all classes, as Peel has said,[2] reacted to circumstances, and advanced or receded in their views and practice in response to the needs of the state, the attitude of the authorities, and the support of noblemen and gentry. Estimated by the Spanish observers to be 5,000 strong, their numbers were probably greater than the 200 calculated by Grindal.[3] Tenuous and elusive as are the traces of these various groups as they clandestinely worshipped in precarious refuges in the capital, there is enough evidence to show the close links between their spiritual leaders and those who had been ejected from their cures in 1566, and between the activities of these separatist congregations and the development shortly afterwards of a London classical movement.

Holy Trinity, a small church situated in the Minories,

---

1. The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. W.Nicholson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1843), 203-4.
2. A.Peel, The First Congregational Churches (1920), 13.
3. Ibid. 14.

formed an important bridge between the established church and the separatist organisations. Constituted a parish church some time between the dissolution of the priory of Holy Trinity and 1550,[1] it was a donative curacy, the minister in the Elizabethan period being appointed and paid by the parishioners whose representatives collected the rectorial dues. Jealous of their liberties in civil administration by virtue of the erstwhile monastic privileges enjoyed in the precinct, the inhabitants for a time also claimed exemption from episcopal jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs. Not until 1574, it appears, did parochial representatives attend the bishop's visitation, while the first minister to be licensed by the ordinary to serve the cure in the Minories was Thomas Cobhed in 1579.[2] The immunities enjoyed by the parish made it a popular refuge for ministers ejected from more vulnerable cures, and the church during the reign became the leading radical enclave in London. The patronage of that formidable old exile, the Duchess of Suffolk, who owned much property in the Minories, added to its importance.

Among the ministers who occasionally preached in the

---

1. The earliest reference to the parish church known to E.M. Tomlinson was 1557 (A History of the Minories (1907), 161). But Robert Oliver, gentleman of the Minories, by his will dated May 1st, 1550, left £1 for the repair of the parish church of the Minories (P.C.C. 15 Coope). I am indebted to Mr. K.G. Mcdonnell of Queen Mary's College for this reference.
2. GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.]; LCCRO. Lib% VG. Hamond, f.140r.

Minories between 1567-70, were Standen, Allen, Crowley, Gough, and Kelly, all of whom had lost parochial positions for nonconformity.[1] Some of the last sermons delivered by Coverdale before his death were from this pulpit.[2] William Kethe, the metrical psalmist and one of the translators of the Genevan bible, was a favourite preacher before his departure in 1569 on the Northern expedition against Popish rebels.[3] John Field, Giles Sinclair, Nicholas Standen, and perhaps Thomas Wilcox, later to be founder members of the London Prebyterian classis, were active from time to time in the parish.[4] Of most immediate significance was the connection between the church and several of the leaders of the separatist congregations in the city. Pattenson, a protégé of the Duchess of Suffolk, who was imprisoned in September 1567 for preaching without a licence,[5] delivered a sermon at the Minories three months later, on the same day that the duchess gave 10/- to the church.[6] Accused at his examination of being without a cure, he had replied that his cure was "...wheresoever I do meet with a congregation that are willing to hear the word of God preached

---

1. Tomlinson, op.cit. 213,220,369. Tomlinson's source was the CWA. of the parish, the relevant volume of which has most unfortunately disappeared since 1907.
2. Ibid. 279-80, cf. Notes and Queries, lst.series,xii (1855), 443.
3. Tomlinson, op.cit. 280.
4. Ibid. 279-80. For Wilcox, cf. ibid. 376.
5. Peel, op.cit. 8.
6. Tomlinson, op.cit. 279.

at my mouth."[1] Such a congregation evidently existed in the Minories.

The 'Mr. Browne' who preached at the church on several occasions in 1567, may have been John Browne, chaplain to the duchess,[2] and said by Stow to be the minister of a separatist congregation.[3] Jackson, who was for nine months the minister at the Minories in 1569, and who spent the first three months of 1570 in prison, was very probably the Seth Jackson whose will was proved in August 1570;[4] his bequests included gifts to Wilcox, Standen, Crane, and Bonham, all of whom were associated with the Minories. Other beneficiaries were Christopher Coleman Robert Gates, John Benson, and Alexander Lacy, all four of whom were members of the separatist congregation released from Bridewell in April 1569.[5] This Bridewell group included several members who had earlier belonged to the Plumbers Hall congregation, and to that discovered in a goldsmith's house in St. Martin in the Fields in the summer of 1568.[6] Was this congregation established in the Minories by 1570? Jackson specified that his body be buried "...where the Congregation shall thincke good;"[7] if, - as is very probable -, he were

---

1. Peel, op.cit. 8.
2. Correspondence of Matthew Parker 1535-75, ed. J.Bruce, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1853), 390.
3. Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles, ed. J.Gairdner, Camden Soc. (1880), xxviii, 143.
4. Tomlinson, op.cit. 166,220; GLMS. 9051/3, f.253v.
5. Strype, Grindal, 201.
6. 6 of 8 men named at Plumbers Hall were in the St. Martin's assembly, as were 10 of those released from Bridewell in 1569 (Peel, op.cit.10).
7. GLMS. 9051/3, f.253v.

minister at the Minories at the time of his death, this specification certainly suggests a relationship between the minister and his parishioners that was quite alien to Anglican belief.

The most conclusive evidence of the intimate links between the church in the Minories and the separatist groups, is provide by the activities of the celebrated nonconformist pioneers, Nicholas Crane and William Bonham. No details are available of the early career of the latter, but Crane is known to have been ordained under the Anglican ordinal, and to have been vicar of Deptford from 1562-6.[1] Both appear afterwards to have been associated with the congregation apprehended in St. Martin's in early 1568, and spent the following year in prison. They were released from Bridewell in April 1569, on taking a pledge not to preach before or be present at, any private assemblies.[2] For a time they were based in the Minories, probably as lecturers,[3] but they were not long at large. Accused of breaking their pledge, they were again arrested, and, along with Jackson, the minister at the Minories, they spent at least part of 1570 in prison. The parishioners did not forget them, periodically sending sums of money,[4] some of which was diverted from the parish poor box.

---

1. Alumni Cantab. 1,i,412.
2. Strype, Grindal, 226.
3. Tomlinson, op.cit. 166,220.
4. Ibid. 166. The gifts are headed "Given to the preachers in pryson."

Indeed, so diligent was the congregation that an aunt of Bonham was given 4/- in her distress.[1] The petition that was sent to the privy council on behalf of the preachers, by certain "...of us poor men of the city," claiming that Grindal had granted permission to Bonham and Crane to 'keep a lecture' and observe the Genevan model in the sacrament of baptism, may well have come from the Minories.[2] Whether or not as a result of pressure from the council on the bishop, both were released, - Bonham probably before the other -[3], shortly after Sandys' accession to the London see: in August 1570, they both acted as overseers to Seth Jackson's will.[4]

Amid the confusion of the ecclesiastical politics of these years, some tendencies of nonconformist development are at least made clear by the associations between the Minories and the separatist congregations. In the first place, the form of service observed at the church probably adhered more closely to the Genevan than the prescribed Anglican model. Coverdale, who was apparently dispensed from wearing the surplice even after 1566, delivered a number of sermons at the church in 1567. Crowley, whose refusal "...to minister in those conjuring garments of popery", was quoted with approval by a member of th

---

1. Ibid. 360.
2. Strype, Grindal, 227.
3. Parochial gifts to Bonham ceased first. He was ill for a time in 1570. (Tomlinson, op.cit.196).
4. GLMS. 9051/3, f.253v.

apprehended Plumbers Hall assembly,[1] also preached from this pulpit. Jackson, Crane, and Bonham were all arrested for their activities at this church. Jackson's disposal of his body at the behest of 'the congregation'; the patronage of the redoubtable nonconformist, the Duchess of Suffolk; and the peculiar constitution of the donative cure where the donation lay with the parishioners, all suggest that the church enjoyed a form of service, and a relationship between minister and congregation that was perhaps unique within the established church.

This would explain the second point, the close affinity between the church and the separatist congregations. Separatist only through necessity, leaders and members of these assemblies had no scruples about frequenting a church, when its form of service approximated to their own sentiments. Indeed, the first separatist congregation mentioned by Stow "...kept theyr churche in the Minorys withowt Algate."[2] Legacies by the minister of the church to members of the assembly apprehended in St. Martin's in the Field, suggest that at least some of this congregation moved to the Minories on their release from Bridewell in 1569, as does the petition made by followers of Bonham and Crane some months later. Likewise, the association of the ministers of separatist congregations with the Minories emphasises their circumstantial character. With the exception of the little known

---

1. Remains of Grindal, 211.
2. Chronicles, 143.

congregation of Richard Fitz, which by virtue of the terms of its covenant has been described as 'a true Congregational Church'[1], these assemblies appear to have been no more than a temporary pis aller when it was not possible to purify the church from within.

Most of them were extremely short-lived. Grindal's sympathy with the radical element in the church did not lessen his intolerance of extra-parochial forms of activity. Confessin to Parker early in 1567 that he could "...hardly reduce things to conformity, if I deal in it alone"[2], he made increasing use of the laws of the Ecclesiastical Commission in his later years.[3] Preaching licences were inspected and more closely supervised; a precept was issued by the Lord Mayor ordering the arrest of unauthorised preachers, and naming the four most persistent transgressors.[4] Early in 1568, another order in the same vein commanded the apprehension of "...certayne persons that take upon them as mynysters to preach within mens houses not beinge admytted to any suche mynystery or funcion At undue tymes gatheringe unto them muche simple and Evell Disposed people."[5] Grindal did not hesitate to imprison offenders, clerical or lay,

---

1. Peel, op.cit. 41. The congregation elected its officers, and exercised discipline.
2. Remains, 291.
3. Ibid. 293/4.
4. LCRO. Journals, 19,f.48r. Two of those named, Standen and Browne, were frequent preachers at the Minories in 1567. The others, John Baron and William Marten, had before 1566 been curates of St. Lawrence Pountney and St. Mary Magdalene Milk St. respectively.
5. LCRO. Rep. 16, f.334r.

in his determination to suppress the conventicles. In 1570, he advocated the removal of leading prisoners to Oxford and Cambridge, "...because all prisoners, for any colour of any religion, be it never so wicked, find great supportation and comfort in London."[1] Grindal's uncompromising policy appears to have met with some success. The separatist excesses of recen years were effectively quelled by the time he departed to York in 1570, although the 'Genevan' pocket in the Minories was still far from disciplined; the death of the imprisoned minister and deacon of Fitz's 'gathered congregation' before 1571, put a halt to separatist activity in London for a decade.

(ii) YEARS OF RECOVERY, 1571-6

Nonconformists were fortunate in that Parker did not persis with his candidature of John Aylmer to succeed Grindal in Londor In his place was appointed Edwin Sandys, formerly bishop of Worcester, and an old Marian exile.[3] Despite his popularity in London, where he had already established a reputation as a preacher, his was not a successful ministry neither as an administrator nor a disciplinary agent.[4] [**] His consequent vacillation was soon noticed by Parker, who wrote to Cecil during the course of proceedings against a group of

---

1. Strype, Grindal, 230.
2. Correspondence, 350.
3. His patron was the Earl of Leicester (M.M.Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago, 1939), 240.).
4. Supra, pp.113, 61.

[**] He lacked Parker's inflexibility of purpose, finding it difficult, as had Grindal, to forsake entirely his early radicalism [**]

nonconformists in 1571, that he doubted "...whether the bishop of London would deal with me to that effect to suspend them, or deprive them, if they will not assent unto the propositions inserted."[1] Sandys' position was not strengthened by his choice of vicar-general, John Hammond, said to be a kinsman of Alexander Nowell, and known to be a Puritan sympathiser.[2] In such circumstances, nonconformity, both lay and clerical, soon recovered from its post-1566 eclipse.

A symptom of its revival was the popular reaction against the position and, indeed, the retention of the font in parish churches. The desire to remove the font from its traditional site near the entrance to a more prominent position close to the pulpit, was characteristic of reformed church design.[3] "In London," Parker wrote to Burghley in 1573,[4] "our fonts must go down, and the brazen eagles, which were ornaments in the chancel and made for lectures, must be molten to make pots and basins for new fonts." At St. Andrew Holborn, the font was replaced in 1572 by "...a little removing saltseller or thing with a bason their to hold a little water".[5] A tin basin was used for baptism at St. Peter West Cheap in 1573;[6] similar modifications

---

1. Correspondence, 382.
2. DNB. For his Puritan leanings, see R.C.Gabriel, Members of the House of Commons 1586-7 (M.A. London, 1954), 408.
3. G.W.O.Addleshaw and F.Etchells, The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship (1948), 64-5.
4. Correspondence, 454.
5. GLMS. 4249, f.232r.
6. GLMS. 645/1, f.97r.

occurred elsewhere,[1] despite Parker's claim that he had "...sent and sent again, and spoken too...that fonts should not be removed."[2]

Radical preachers thrived in such an atmosphere.[3] Few entered the beneficed ranks; the reason probably lay less in any scruples about subscribing to certain articles of religion which had been made obligatory for all new incumbents by an act passed in 1571,[4] than in the discretion shown by the ecclestical bodies that dominated the patronage scene about admitting suspect conformists.[5] But their screening was not complete. John Presse's collation to St. Matthew Friday Street coincided with the removal of the font.[6] The incumbent of St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street can probably be identified with the Thomas Edmunds who was imprisoned for nonconformity in 1573.[7] James Style, presented by the Lord Chancellor to St. Margaret Lothbury in 1573 at the petition of Lord Gray, found himself in trouble in the episcopal visitation of the following year for defying the bishop's injunction to preach only in his own paris and arguing along stock Puritan lines that an ordained minister

---

1. e.g. St. James Garlickhithe, St. Matthew Friday St..
2. Correspondence, 454.
3. c.f. Earl's observation: "1571: The Contrary Preachers greatly Allowed". (Cul. MS. Mm. 1, 29, f 45v)
4. Statutes of the Realm (1819), iv, 546-7 (13 El.c.12).
5. Supra, p.241.
6. Henn. 435.; GLMS. 1016/1 [no fol.]
7. He was curate at St. Nicholas Acon until 1571 (See Appendix B).

could preach anywhere.[1] He was unfortunate to incur the displeasure of his parishioners as well as that of the bishop, and his resignation shortly afterwards probably forestalled a sentence of deprivation against him.[2] Other Puritan-minded, albeit less turbulent, clerics, who obtained City livings during Sandys' tenure of office, were Thomas Gattacre, a chaplain to the Earl of Leicester, the distinguished academic Thomas White, and Robert Crowley, who was actually elected their vicar by the vestry men of St. Lawrence Jewry in 1575.[3]

The driving force of nonconformity, however, lay elsewhere than among these semi-conformists in City parsonages and vicarages. The London radical scene was dominated by preachers, some of them veterans of the anti-vestiarian campaign, others younger recruits who had spent at least part of their apprenticeship in the nonconformist refuge in the Minories, and who were now taking advantage of the changed climate of religious opinion in the capital. Thomas Wilcox served for a time as a curate in All Hallows Honey Lane, a parish inhabited

---

1. GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.].
2. Owing to his illness, the parish had allowed Style leave of absence in the country. His failure to return within a prescribed time eventually led to a delegation to the bishop that he "...maye be depryved, and that the L. of London maye take some shorter waye for that cawse then by ordynery course of the law for avoydyng of chargis to the paryshe." (GLMS. 4352/1, f.27r.).
3. GLMS. 2590/1, p.51.

by some of the leading Puritan citizens of the day.[1] John Field was attached, either as a curate or a lecturer, to the Minories and St. Giles Cripplegate, probably until his arrest with Wilcox in June 1572 for the authorship of An Admonition to the Parliament.[2] The septuagenarian, Walter Kelly, who had been the first to be ejected from a London cure for nonconformity, was a curate at St. Mary Magdalene Old Fish Street in 1571, and served as an assistant at St. James Garlickhithe from 1573 until his death in 1580.[3] Giles Sinclair regained his curacy in All Hallows Staining for a short time in 1570-1, and remained a parishioner there after a successor had been appointed.[4] Edward Dering was offered a lectureship at St. Lawrence Jewry in 1570,[5] and enjoyed another in St. Paul's until he was silenced at the Queen's express command in 1573.[6] Others, like Fox, Wiburn, and Gough, and the extremists Standen, Bonham and Crane, are known to have been in London at this time, probably in the capacity of free-lance preachers or chaplains in sympathetic noble households.[7]

---

1. DNB; The Registers of St.Mary Bow, All Hallows Honey Lane, and of St. Pancras Soper Lane, ed. W.B.Bannerman, Harleian Soc. 44,Pt.1 (1914), 104. Some of the Scottish Presbyterians in the 1580s lodged in Honey Lane with Anthony Martin (G.Donaldson,The Relations Between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604, Ph.D.London (1938), 185).
2. Tomlinson, op.cit.220,375. cf. Appendix B.
3. GLMS. 9051/3, f.268r.; GLMS. 4816/1, ff.45r.-53r. passim.
4. GLMS. 9171/16, f.40r.; GLMS. 4958/1-2, passim.
5. GLMS. 2590/1, f.33. The offer does not appear to have been taken up.
6. APC. viii, 133.
7. Gough's death early in 1572 was a blow to the nonconformist: (For his will see LCCRO. Ct. Reg. Bullock, f.161v.).

Inspired by Cartwright's lectures at Cambridge, and under the direction of Field and Wilcox, the hard core of the City radicals began, - probably as early as 1570 -, to "...meete together att ther owne howses by course, and that uppon the Monday firste, and afterwards on the thursdaye And when they mett they / used to interprete some booke of scripture..."[1] Members of these early 'conferences', as they were called by Bancroft,[2] were Field, Wilcox, Standen, Jackson, Bonham, Sinclair, Crane, and Edmunds, and occasionally "...some strange mynister (cominge to the towne beinge acquainted with them or els desirous to be acquainted with them)..." With the exception of Edmunds, they had all served or preached, as we have seen, in the Minories; there can be little doubt that the roots of the London brotherhood were to be found in the Minories between 1567-70.[3] Of the eight members, only Edmunds held a benefice, and Sinclair for a short time a perpetual curacy. Thus, from its earliest days the brotherhood tended to be

---

1. This information is taken from a deposition made by Thomas Edmunds during the Star Chamber case against leading nonconformists in 1591 (PRO. Star Chamber 5, A 49/34, f.4r.). Edmunds dated the origins of the 'conferences' "...about twenty years nowe laste paste." Jackson, one of the members named by Edmunds died in August, 1570 (GLMS. 9051/3, f.253v.). I owe the Star Chamber reference to the kindness of Dr.P.Collinson.
2. The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. R.G.Usher, Camden Soc. 3rd.series,viii.5.
3. Contemporary wills reflect the growth of this ministerial association. Robert Halsey, in Sept. 1569, left money to Gough Field, Bonham, Standen, Jackson, and Browne - preachers "...whom in my liff time I have loved and harde" (GLMS. 9171/15, f.343v. Beneficiaries of Jackson's will in 1570 included Crane, Bonham, Wilcox, and Standen (GLMS. 9051/3, f.253.v.).

divorced from the beneficed ranks of the clergy, in sharp contrast, for instance, with the Dedham classis, several of whose members were local incumbents.[1] While a public platform as an assistant curate or a lecturer was available, the difference was not important, but as nonconformists found such posts increasingly difficult to obtain post-1580, there was a real risk of the presbyterian campaign being denied any form of public expression in the city.

Their early activity was 'nothing so forward', according to Bancroft,[2] as that of the alleged Wandsworth presbytery. Little was debated "...but against subscription, the attyre, and booke of Common Prayer." At least some members, however, were involved in the consultations between radical leaders that led to the publication of An Admonition to the Parliament,[3] a pamphlet attacking the episcopal system, and demanding the substitution of the presbyterian form of organisation. Its publication made clear the division between the militant wing of Puritanism, and the older and less uncompromising nonconformists; its abuse of the bishops sparked off an intensiv counter-attack, literary and disciplinary.

Action against nonconformist ministers in London had proceeded in desultory fasion in the early years of Sandys'

---

1. cf. Presbyterian Movement, xxxv-xlviii, passim. 6 of 20 were beneficed, while Usher had no information of 8 others.
2. Ibid. 5.
3. Knappen, op.cit. 234.

episcopacy. Following the limited form of subscription introduced in the 1571 Parliament,[1] and the revised regulations concerning preaching licences embodied in the canons of that year,[2] a number of Puritan leaders were summoned before the High Commission and were required to conform to the articles of religion, the use of the surplice, and the Book of Common Prayer. Among them were the Londoners, Dering, Browne, Field, Gough, Wiburn, and Robert Johnson, a preacher at St. Clement Danes. Parker could not rely on the support of Sandys to deprive those who "...will not assent unto the propositions inserted",[4] and it is possible that he accepted the limited offer of subscription including conformity to the Prayer Book, proposed by the nonconformists.[5] Their activities were certainly not restricted neither by these proceedings, nor by the visitation undertaken by Sandys later in the year.

The literary controversy aroused by the Admonition, the evidence of popular support for the imprisoned authors, Field and Wilcox, and the infiltration of nonconformists into the most public of all pulpits at Paul's Cross,[6] made essential a

---

1. Subscription was required to those articles "...which only concern the Confession of a true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments." Ministers ordained between the Elizabethan accession and 1571 were exempt. (Statutes, iv, 546-7 (13 El.c.12).
2. Card. Synod, i, 126-7; cf. Parker's Corr. 382-3.
3. Knappen, op.cit. 230.
4. Corr. 382.
5. SP 1, 82. Browne was sheltered by the Duchess of Suffolk (Parker's Corr. 390).
6. Strype, Whitgift, iii, 32-3.

comprehensive campaign of disciplinary action. "These authors of sedition," wrote Sandys to Burghley in August 1573 "[are] now esteemed as Gods, as Field, Wilcox, Cartwright... The people resort unto them as in popery they were wont to run on pilgrimage." So perturbed was Sandys, whose proposal for a disputation between the rival factions had met with a veto from Burghley, that he sought the advice of continental Protestant leaders about ways of dealing with these "...foolish young men, who while they despise authority, and admit of no superior, are seeking the complete overthrow and rooting up of our whole ecclesiastical polity..." Sandys had not long to wait for harsher counsel from another source. The attempted assassination of John Hawkins by a fanatic returning from Sampson's lecture at Whittington College, seriously alarmed the Queen, and shortly afterwards, the privy council, at her behest, wrote to Sandys, making him most responsible for the "... contentious and uncomly disputacons and dissensions rysen..." His visitations, it was commonly said, "...be only used of you and your officers to gett money, or for som other pourposes." He was instructed to visit his diocese, to summon before him all

---

1. Ibid. 33.
2. For Cartwright's stay in London 1572-3, cf. A.F.Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism (Cambridge 1925), 82,106,118.
3. Knappen, op.cit. 240.
4. Zurich Letters 1558-79, ed. H.Robinson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1842), 1,295.
5. Addit. MS. 48064, f.204r. and v. (Nov. 2nd, 1573).

those detected of irregular activity, and to proceed against them by ecclesiastical censure.

Stung by the reprimand, Sandys took drastic, albeit belated action. The London ministers were summoned before the chancellor, Hammond, at St. Lawrence Jewry, early in December, "...and ther subscribed and wer commanded to put on their trash as surplesses etc: on the Sunday following, being the thirteenth of December."[1] Subscription was also required of "...the Common people, such as they call Puritanes." Several were committed to gaol, including Edmunds, Johnson, Fuller, and the layman William White;[2] Edmund's offence was his failure to observe the Prayer Book, and his sermons "...not onlie in the defense of Puritanisme...but also against this Commission, by which gods saynts are punished."[3] Edmunds alone of the London brotherhood is known to have been imprisoned, several of the others having apparently temporarily evacuated themselves from the capital.[4]

Early in January, 1574, further tests were made. Certificates were issued to the church wardens of every parish, requiring them to present any who had failed to comply with the

---

1. Thus did Thomas Wilcox describe the proceedings in his letter to Anthony Gilby, Dec. 21st., 1573 (CUL.MS.Mm,1,43,441-2.).
2. Ibid. 441.
3. Ibid. 441.
4. Wilcox wrote to Gilby from Coventry in December, 1573; Standen was in Northamptonshire (Lansd. MS. 17,27); Crane may have been in Roehampton (cf. Scott Pearson, op.cit. 80).

December instructions to wear a surplice;[1] the forms were then delivered to the chancellor who took action accordingly. At least four parishes evidently reported that there was no surplice available for the minister to wear, for their church accounts in that year recorded the purchase of cloth to make a surplice.[2] At St. Botolph Aldgate, a sum was spent "...for mending the surplice torne by a madman."[3]

Such irregularities reflected past negligence on the part of the diocesan administrators, but the inquisition of 1573-4 on the whole testified to the weakness of radical spirit among the beneficed clergy, - as distinct from the unattached minister -, of London. Not one incumbent was deprived for refusing to subscribe, although Edmunds probably resigned his living to avoid such an indignity.[4] According to Wilcox,[5] none had "... more deceived the godlie, then one Wager", rector of St. Benet Gracechurch, who "...now by his Subscription hath allowed all."[6] Edward Dering, embittered by his suspension from all preaching, likewise referred scathingly to the conformability of London ministers who "...while they flatter to gett Lyvings, they make

---

1. GLMS. 1002/1, f.174r.
2. St. Alphage (rector T.Mortibois); St. Botolph Bishopsgate (T.Simpson); St. Ethelburgh (H.Treton); and St. Peter West Cheap (E.Simpson).
3. GLMS. 9235/1. [no fol.]
4. cf. GLMS. 2596/1, f.156r.
5. CUL. MS.Mm,1,43,p.441.
6. He had been silenced by order of the privy council in July 1573 only a month after the relaxation of an earlier inhibition. (APC.viii,120,133).

the Pulpitt to be contemned...These Words they doe not edifie the Conscience of Man."[1]

So improved was the outward state of affairs by the summer of 1574 that Sandys, in sharp contrast to his letters of the previous year, was able to write optimistically to Rodolph Gualter that "our innovators...are not doing us much harm; nor is this new fabric of theirs, making such progress as they expected."[2] His sanguinity may have been encouraged by his experiences on his triennial visitation, in progress for most of that summer. In London, only James Stile, rector of St. Margaret Lothbury, who asserted his right to preach anywhere without the authority of a licence, seems to have caused much trouble;[3] but it should be noted that unattached lecturers were not at that date obliged to attend.

The setback to the nonconformist movement in London that resulted from the 1573-4 crisis, however, did not compare with that of 1566. The subscription tests had exposed the weakness of radical fervour in the parsonage and the vicarage house, and Sandys had struck at the immunity enjoyed by the church in the Minories when he obliged the churchwardens to attend his 1574 visitation.[4] But the activities of City lecturers were yet to

---

1. HMC. Hatfield MSS,ii,63.
2. Zurich Letters, i,312. cf. Sandys to Bullinger (ibid. 311).
3. GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.].
4. The incumbent was excused (GLMS. 9537/3 [no fol.]. Tomlinson thought the parish resisted episcopal pressure until 1577 (op. cit. 170).

be disciplined, and the ministers attached to the Minories still asserted their independence from episcopal jurisdiction.[1] The orthodoxy of Sandys himself, despite his recent actions, was still suspect to Burghley, to whom the bishop wrote pleading for a fair hearing, and complaining that "...I remayne blotted and defaced, my Office is slandered, and the Gospel which I preach male audit."[2]

In one respect, the bishop was spared the problems of some of his colleagues. Prophesyings, the periodic conventions of clergy and laity intended to improve ministerial learning, which were becoming fashionable in several rural dioceses, did not, according to the testimony of the archdeacon of London, take root in that city.[3] The retention of the control of the normal archdiaconal exercises by a man experienced against irregularities by his membership of the High Commission;[4] the paucity of Puritans among the beneficed clergy; the opportunities provided in London for private clerical discussions and conferences; and the high academic standards of the City ministry, may all be possible explanations.[5] Elsewhere, prophesyings sometimes proved to be the embryonic form of Presbyterian classes;[6] in London, no such link existed, and the

---

1. A minister, donated before 1574, did not obtain a licence to serve the cure until 1578 (ibid.220).
2. HMC. Hatfield MSS.ii,79.
3. Mullins to Sandys, July 1576 (Addit.MS.29546, f.54v.)
4. R.G.Usher, The Rise and Fall of the High Commission (Oxford 1913), 355.
5. cf. Supra, pp.119-21.
6. Scott-Pearson, op.cit. 157.

Puritan movement probably suffered in the long run from this lack of contact with the wider body of incumbents and their assistants.

The immediate fortunes of the London brotherhood, however, prospered during the declining years of Sandys' episcopacy. Of the original members, Jackson had died, while Standen and Bonham, both in prison in the early part of 1574, appear to have forsaken London on their release.[1] The others, all of whom except Sinclair had likewise spent part of their recent lives in prison, remained active in the capital. The losses were quickly replenished by the recruitment "...into the Company" of William Charke, Walter Travers, Thomas Barber, Richard Gardiner, and George Cheston between 1575-6.[2] Charke was a product of Peterhouse who had lost his fellowship in 1572 for his anti-episcopal opinions.[3] Chaplaincies in the household of Lord Cheney and later of the Duchess of Somerset, and a short-lived preaching position in Gray's Inn, gave him some security until he was appointed preacher at Lincoln's Inn in 1581.[4] Travers was a less permanent asset to the London group, spending much of his time between 1576-80 on the continent where in 1578 he underwent a Presbyterian form of ordination at the hands of

---

1. APC. viii,235,259. No trace of Bonham's activities post-1574 can be found; Standen was back in London by 1577 (SP,i,137).
2. PRO. Star Chamber 5, A 49/34, f.4v.
3. Alumni Cantab. 1,i,324.
4. DNB. For his Gray's Inn position, cf. R.J.Fletcher, The Pension Book of Gray's Inn (1901), i,22.

Cartwright and others.[1] Gardiner's affiliation several years after his ordination in London, may have been due to Charke, probably his contemporary at Peterhouse.[2] A local man by birth, he alone of the fraternity held a benefice after Edmund's resignation from Milk Street in 1575, although his church was outside the archdeaconry of London.[3] Thomas Barber had been a supporter of Cartwright at Cambridge where he took a degree in divinity before settling in London about 1575.[4] His popularity as a preacher brought him several lecturing posts in City parishes.[5] With the exception of the veteran Sinclair, the least known member of the group was George Cheston who alone appears to have had no university education. Very possibly he was an old Marian exile;[6] like Barber, he prospered as a parish lecturer, and was for a time based in the Minories.[7]

The core of the nonconformist resistance to Aylmer had thus already consolidated its position in London before the departure of Sandys.[8] It was composed of men who, one critic declared, "...will preach and read lectures, will freely fast long prayers and sharp invectives against all other in the ministery and

---

1. Alumni Cantab, 1,iv,262.
2. Ibid. 1,ii,193. He was ordained by Grindal in 1569 (GLMS. 9535/1, f.141r.).
3. He was rector of St. Mary Whitechapel (in the gift of the rector of Stepney) in the archdeaconry of Middlesex, from 1570-1617.
4. DNB.
5. See Appendix C.
6. Christine Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge 1938),118.
7. Tomlinson, op.cit.166.
8. PRO. SP.12/93/8, p.632.

sometyme catechise privately and publikly sometyme one way sometyme another neither keeping any stay." Unless, like Charke, they managed to obtain a chaplaincy,[1] most of them were dependent on the patronage of citizens who appointed to lectureships and nominated to sermons. Despite evidence of lay support,[2] whether in the form of legacies or of commemorative sermons at the appointment of private people or the City corporation,[3] their vulnerability to popular whims exposed the hazards of their position. In such circumstances, nothing could have reassured them less than the substitution of Aylmer for Sandys.

(iii) THE AGE OF AYLMER

a) Preliminary Skirmishes 1577-82

In his mid-fifties on his consecration on March 24th, 1577, Aylmer found belated preferment after spending fifteen years in a Lincolnshire archdeaconry.[4] His merits had not passed unnoticed by Burghley, an early patron, or by Parker who had tentatively

---

1. Cheston also held a chaplaincy - with the Earl of Warwick - for a time (cf. Lambeth, Calendar of licences in the archiepiscopal registers [no date].
2. The most munificent testator between 1574-6 may have been Christopher Battle of All Hallows the Great, who died in 1574. Money was donated to Field, Wilcox, Edmunds, Charke, Standen, Bonham, Crane, and Sinclair, i.e. all the existing members of the brotherhood. Nor were the widows of Gough and Robert Johnson forgotten (GLMS. 9051/4, f.56r.).
3. Charke and Travers were sometimes invited by the Court of Aldermen to preach at lesser City festivals, but the Spital sermons were almost invariably reserved for members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (LCRO. Rep.17,f.8r.; Letter Bk.,Z,f.239
4. Cecil procured for him the archdeaconry of Lincoln in 1562 (Strype, Aylmer, 12).

considered him for the London episcopacy in 1570, and had later invited him to write the Anglican reply to the Presbyterian De Disciplina.[1] But neither the Queen, who disliked the views expressed in his An Harborowe for faithfull and trewe Subjects (1559), nor the more radical members of the privy council, impatient with the rigid conservatism of an old Zurich exile, spared him much sympathy, and his early promise remained unfulfilled until eventually he secured the all-important favour of Christopher Hatton.[2]

Years of fruitless expectation had left their mark on a man morose by nature. Excessively sycbphantic with those upon whose patronage he depended,[3] he made no attempt to court a wider public. Obsequious on the one hand, his petulance with his colleagues endeared him to neither of the principal bodies on the London scene, the City corporation and the chapter of St. Paul's.[4] An unimaginative and unresponsive personality, he was yet in many ways better equipped than either Grindal or Sandys for his task in London. He was conscientious, shrewd and practical, his indifference to his own unpopularity lending him

---

1. Parker's Correspondence, 350,477.
2. Aylmer's debt to Hatton is clear from his letter of March 20th, 1582, pleading for a transfer elsewhere. "I pray you be as earnest now in taking the burthen on yourself as you were willing at the first to lay it upon me." (H.Nicolas, Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton (1848), 240).
3. e.g. his letter to Hatton, June 8th, 1578 (Nicolas, op.cit. 58-9).
4. cf. his letter to the Lord Mayor, March 1st, 1582 (Documents Illustrating the History of St. Paul's Cathedral, ed. W.S. Simpson, Camden Soc. (1880), 128-30.).

a ruthlessness missing in his predecessors. If he lacked vision he was inflexible and single-minded in his conception of diocesa administration. To the Puritan, Aylmer's "...longe wished for purpose," was to reduce the church "...to a dead carcasse, that she maye be utterly buried."[1] Aylmer himself termed it rather differently, remaining consistent to the aims he outlined in 1578. "...to correct offenders on both sides which swerve from the right path of obedience, which I set up as the mark to aim at, purposing to discipline both the Papist and the Puritan,... and bring great unity of government to the Church which her Majesty in her godly wisdom so thirsteth after."[2] The ideal, admittedly, of an executive, nevertheless, the conditions of the mid-Elizabethan period made it relevant, realistic, and rewarding.

One of Aylmer's first actions was to replace the somewhat easy-going John Hammond by the Yorkshire-born Edward Stanhope as his vicar-general.[3] Discovered by Aylmer himself,[4] Stanhope was on the threshold of a long and distinguished career in the sphere of ecclesiastical administration, a career that showed him to be strongly orthodox in his opinions, and a loyal practitioner of Aylmer's policy. His retention as diocesan chancellor by four subsequent bishops, and his appointment by

---

1. This was Field's description to Gilby in 1581 (CUL.MS.Mm,1, 43,23,p446.).
2. Nicolas, op.cit.56.
3. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.66v.
4. Such, at least, was the claim made by Lady Ann, the mother o Stanhope, in 1579. (Lansd. MS. 28,67).

Whitgift to be vicar-general of the whole province of Canterbury, bore testimony to the respect with which he was held by the Anglican hierarchy.[1]

Soon after his installation, Aylmer set out on his primary visitation of his diocese, but the plague outbreak in the summer of 1577 caused him to postpone the City phase of his tour until the following December.[2] His visitation articles reflect his appreciation of the infiltration of Presbyterian practices into parochial activities. One item dealt, apparently for the first time, with the growth of unauthorised parish lectureships in the city;[3] another, which inquired about the erection of a 'presbytery of eldership', and the admission into the ministry of unlawfully ordained men, has been described by Kennedy as the first definite witness in Elizabethan visitation documents to the growth of Puritan nonconformity.[4] In London, the independence of the parish in the Minories was further undermine by the attendance of the incumbent at the visitation and the payment of dues to the bishop.[5] Judicial proceedings were started against Cheston, a member of the clandestine City brotherhood, who at that time was a lecturer in the Minories. The church-wardens as well as the preacher were summoned before

---

1. DNB.
2. GLMS. 9537/4, passim; GLMS 9235/1 [no fol.].
3. W.P.M.Kennedy, Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, Alcuin Club Collections, xxvi (1924), ii,48.
4. Ibid, ii,49.
5. GLMS. 9537/4 [no fol.]; Tomlinson, op.cit.167.

the bishop; Cheston was imprisoned, and the others returned home to "...supper...amonge the hole parrishe."[1] Other members of the fraternity were also cited before Aylmer in 1577, but their fate appears to have been less cruel than that of Cheston. The bishop's suggestion to Burghley that Charke, Field, Wilcox, and Edmund Chapman be sent like missionaries into Lancashire, Staffordshire, and Shropshire, "...and such like other barbarous counties to draw the people from Papism and gross ignorance,"[3] fell apparently on stony ground.

In fact, the classical group in London survived largely unscathed, and demonstrated its radicalism in a vigorous exchange of correspondence with Cartwright at Antwerp.[4] The los of Travers, who joined Cartwright in November 1578,[5] was compensated shortly afterwards by the recruitment of the Peterhouse Fellow, Stephen Egerton, and Thomas Crooke, an older man who for a decade had been beneficed in Suffolk.[6] Both distinguished preachers, their presence in London gave the Puritan movement an added prestige. Other newcomers to the city of varying shades of radicalism, helped to widen the basis of support for their cause. Some were able to secure livings.

---

1. Ibid. 166.
2. P.Collinson, The Puritan Classical Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth I (Ph.D.London, 1957), 372 (note), has revised Peel's dating of a document which placed Field's suspension in 1577 (SP i,135-6), and has post-dated it to 1585.
3. Lansd. MS. 25,30.
4. SP.i,137-8.
5. Scott-Pearson, op.cit. 172-4.
6. PRO. Star Chamber 5, A49/34, f.4v.

Andrew Castleton was presented by the Lord Chancellor to St. Martin Iremonger, and though blind, became well-known as an all too rare Puritan type of 'faithful pastor'.[1] Thomas Spering, an associate of Egerton but a semi-conformist himself, was curate of St. Anne Blackfriars as well as rector of the St. Paul's benefice, St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street.[2] The veteran Crowley, restored to the beneficed ranks by his election by the vestry to the vicarage of St. Lawrence Jewry in 1575, was re-granted his old church at Cripplegate in 1578; he also enjoyed several parish lectureships,[3] and was probably the most sought after preacher in London to deliver funeral sermons.[4] His value as a Puritan preacher, however, had dwindled with the years, and he appears to have broken altogether with Field's radical group by this time.[5] Others, like Thomas Cobhed, Richard Benbow, and the old Norwich preacher, Richard Gawton, were established as lecturers or assistant curates about the city.

Burdened as he was by the extra responsibilities, including the control of the High Commission, imposed upon him by the sequestration of Archbishop Grindal in 1578, Aylmer found less

---

1. cf. SP. ii, 96.
2. GLMS. 9537/4 [no fol.].
3. See Appendix C.
4. cf. GLMS. 9051/4, f.82r.; GLMS. 9171/16, f.313v. A close runner-up was Wm. Wager.
5. This is suggested by Field's comment: "Mr. Crowley is no such man as your letters purporte, I would he had kept himself as free from Popish dreggs, as he hath done from those familiar errors and detestable opinions." (Field to Gilby, Feb.28/1581, CUL. MS.Mm,1,43,23,446).

than sufficient time for diocesan duties. But sporadic action against individual preachers was taken by Stanhope. Richard Gawton was excommunicated in February 1579 for contempt of court; three months later he appealed for absolution, granted to him on swearing an oath of obedience to the Queen, her ecclesiastical laws, and the bishop of London.[1] Shortly afterwards he became vicar of Hemel Hempstead.[2]

The most spectacular episcopal action, however, was the revival of that old-established disciplinary weapon, the interdict. So rarely invoked was the censure, which involved the denial of Christian sacrament and service to a whole congregation, that it was not to be found in post-Reformation codifications of ecclesiastical laws.[3] Its introduction by Aylmer against two churches, St. Anne Blackfriars and Holy Trinity Minories,[4] reflects his view of the extreme gravity of the position. Both parishes were donative curacies, whose incumbents were appointed by Sir George More and by the parishioners respectively. With regard to the Minories, the interdict marked the climax to a decade of struggle between bishop and parish; Blackfriars had no such turbulent background,

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1579-81, f.27r.
2. Lincoln Episcopal Records, ed. C.W.Foster, Lincoln Rec.Soc., ii (1912), 70.
3. Burn, ii, 340-1. Baptism, however, was permitted. Occasionally, blood-spilling on consecrated ground led to an interdict (e.g. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Huick, f.137r.)
4. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, ff.120r.,122r. (Blackfriars July 10th, 1578; Minories August 9th, 1578.)

although it was later to become a leading nonconformist enclave. The interdict was an attempt to discipline both laity and clergy in parishes where previous censures had concentrated on the minister. Its potency was soon revealed. The curate and the church-wardens of the Minories appeared within two days before Aylmer; submitted, and later entered into bonds with security to observe the Prayer Book in the administration of the Holy Communion.[2] The interdict was then relaxed, as was that against Blackfriars after a more prolonged resistance lasting two months.[3] Effective enough as a short-term penalty, it cured neither parish of its ardent radicalism; its disciplinary value could not compensate for the disrepute caused by the infliction of an indiscriminate and anachronistic method of coercion, and Aylmer did not persist with its use.

Subtler methods were needed to strike at the source of clerical nonconformity. The ultimate answer was a rigid form of subscription, but the climate of opinion as well as the paralysi at Canterbury precluded such a possibility in 1579-80. Aylmer turned his attention to the parish lectureships, the focal

---

1. Its past ministers were mainly moderate Puritans like William Wager, Francis Scarlet, and Christopher Watson, the author of a popular catechism. (DNB).
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.122r. Tomlinson, op.cit. 167. The minister was Robert Heaz, better known as the perpetual curate of St. Botolph Aldgate.
3. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.124v. The curate was Thomas Spering, who was also rector of St. Mary Magdalene Milk Street.

point of Puritan activity in London, and as yet relatively immune from episcopal surveillance.[1] He, it was said, was largely responsible for the issue of a letter by the privy council in January 1580, protesting against the division in the ministry between "reading" ministers and "preachers and no-sacrament minister".[2] All preachers were ordered to administer the Holy Communion in their own persons at certain times of the year. Shortly afterwards, Aylmer drew up a list of articles for the archdeaconry of London based on these instructions.[3]

Leading Puritans commented in alarm, for lecturers were now obliged to perform the sacraments according to the order laid down in the Prayer Book. The bishop "...forestauleth many good men," protested Field to Gilby,[4] "either to throwe them out, or else to gravell the Consciences, that they may stick in the same filth that he doth, of superstitious Ceremonies." Robert Beale likewise condemned this "...fetche of the Bishopp of London, practised as it was thought to suppresse the Readers in London."[5]

Their worst fears were not realised. The matter, according to Beale,[6] "...was stayed and proceaded in no further" until

---

1. Robert Beale and John Field both made him responsible.
2. Card. Doc. Annals, 1,440-1.
3. Strype, Aylmer, 43-4.
4. CUL. MS.Mm,1,43,23,p.446.
5. Addit. MS. 48039, f.20v.
6. Ibid, f.21r.

1584, probably because of lack of support from the privy council, which was at that time devising a scheme to increase the number of preachers in London.[1] Lecturers were not examined at the episcopal visitation in August, 1580, although Aylmer did attempt to impose a rule that "...no man shall meddle in a nother man's cure where there is a preacher for that bredyth many inconveniences."[2] One or two nonconformists, including Eusebius Paget who may have come to London after his deprivation from a Northamptonshire benefice in 1576, and Thomas Barber, described by Aylmer as a "...depravor of the ministers,"[3] were cited before the authorities, but were not long inactive.

In fact, the Puritan cause was flourishing in London in the years immediately before Whitgift's accession to Canterbury, despite the forebodings of Field, and Aylmer's assurance to Walsingham that "...the City is quiet and as well taught as ever yt was."[4] Six members of the clandestine Presbyterian classis held parish lectureships,[5] while Charke, Travers, and Crooke were preaching in the Inns of Court.[6] A Puritan preaching platform was created in Christ Church in 1581 when an endowment, originally intended to maintain singing priests, was diverted

---

1. Supra, pp.428-30 In May, 1579, Aylmer had blamed Burghley for his lack of encouragement for the bishop's policy (Scott-Pearson op.cit. 235).
2. Egerton MS. 1693, f.103r.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. (March 11th, 1583).
5. Field, Cheston, Edmunds, Egerton, Crooke, and Barber.
6. Charke at Lincoln's Inn, Travers at the Temple, and Crooke at Gray's Inn.

to support four lecturers.[1] More obscure semi-conforming ministers attached themselves to assistant or perpetual curacies Radical sentiment in the beneficed ranks was still lamentably weak, but at least one recruit was found in the person of Jonas Jerdfield, recently sequestered from his vicarage in Bishop's Stortford for refusing to church women "...wearing Rayles or vayles"[3], a characteristic Puritan scruple. He was presented in 1582 to St. Mary Abchurch by a group of citizens who had purchased the advowson pro hac vice.[4] Other newcomers of the 'demi-pure' type[5] were Richard Caser at All Hallows Honey Lane and Meredith Hanmer in Shoreditch.

Symptoms of the strength of nonconformist feeling in the capital were seen in a mild revival of iconoclastic activity in the parish churches. Favourite targets were the rood lofts that still survived from the destruction in the beginning of the reign,[6] and the partitions that stood between the chancel and the nave.[7] Unanimity, however, was not always forthcoming in these matters. A special court under Stanhope sat in the church of St. Martin Orgar to decide a case brought by a group of parishioners against a church-warden who, contrary both to

---

1. St. Barts. Hos. Rec. Office, Ha.1/2, f.182v.
2. e.g. George Closse (St. Magnus), Richard Proctor (St.Botolph Billingsgate), Hugh Smith (St. Michael Cornhill) (SP.1,221.).
3. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Hamond, f.176r.
4. Henn. 297; GLMS. 9531/13, f.207r.
5. Thus described by an Anglican critic (PRO. SP. 12/93/8).
6. e.g. St. Botolph Aldgate, St. Mary Woolnoth.
7. e.g. St. Christopher Stocks, St. Helen Bishopsgate, St. Ethelburgha.

Queen's Injunctions and to a vestry order, had "...plucked downe a decent or comlie particon...betweene the quier and the bodie of the churche."[1] The culprit, insistent that the partition was "...a monument of Idolatrie and superstition"[2], was suspended from his wardenship after the case had been taken before the Ecclesiastical Commission.

The anxiety of the London ministers who petitioned Convocation in 1581, was due to more serious aspects of nonconformist activity. Complaints were made against the English preachers in Flanders and Germany "...disallowing the state ecclesiasticall in England", from whose lectures London merchants returned home "...contemptuouse and rebelling against our state ecclesiasticall".[3] This led to "...privett readinge in howses", the infiltration of "straunge preacher[s]" into men's cures, and the tendency of "manie citizens" to desert their own churches and join the reformed Dutch and French churches.[4] The latter complaint was an open acknowledgement of the influence of the foreign congregations in London on the development of nonconformist trends, an influence due not only to the Calvinistic organisation of their churches, but also to the activities of their ministers who were often found preaching or in charge of a Sunday service in City parishes.[5]

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1577-9, f.221v.
2. Ibid, f.224v.
3. Bodl. MS. Wood F30-2, p.87.
4. Ibid. p.87.
5. cf. Tomlinson, op.cit. 213.

Coloured as the petition may have been by the bitter relationship between parson and parish, caused by the tithe controversy,[1] the position in the early 1580s was hardly satisfactory from the Anglican viewpoint. Aylmer's ingenious device to discipline the activities of parish lecturers had yet to be fully applied. Eternal vigilance in the form of frequent summonses of the clergy,[2] and the employment of apparitors to go "...from place to place every Sondaie, to see what Conformit: is used in every parishe",[3] was of some value as a restraint to nonconformist activities, but not until a man of like mentality to Aylmer was appointed to the Canterbury see, were the fortune: of the London radical cause in serious jeopardy.

b) The Battle Joined, 1583-90.

Aylmer's episcopal visitation in the summer of 1583 indicated that a little headway was being made with regard to the unbeneficed preacher. Unattached lecturers were for the first time obliged to attend the visitation session, and one of their number was cited for failing to participate periodically in ~~the~~ administering the communion.at the parish church where h preached.[4] Otherwise, the visitation returns were disappointin only two instances of nonconformist irregularity being

---

1. cf. Chapter VIII, sub Tithe Controversy.
2. cf. Strype, Aylmer, 41-70, passim.
3. Lansd. MS. 33,25. Information given in a letter to Burghley, Nov. 8th, 1581.
4. LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6, vi, f.5r.

detected.[1] Presentments, it was clear, were of limited value when church-wardens and sidemen connived at, or even instigated, ministerial departure from the rites prescribed in the Prayer Book.

The accession of Whitgift, and his transformation of the High Commission, put a much-needed edge to disciplinary technique. Ecclesiastical powers of censorship were strengthene the use of the ex-officio oath was revived; heavier penalties were devised against recalcitrants; most important, the activities of the Commission were emancipated from the control of the privy council.[2] With a revitalised machinery of discipline at his behest, Aylmer henceforward placed less reliance on the traditional system of detecta et comperta in his actions against the City nonconformists.

The immediate task was the application of Whitgift's celebrated eleven articles of uniformity; the crucial item was the sixth, which obliged all ministers, in whatsoever capacity they served, to subscribe to the royal supremacy, the Book of Common Prayer, and the articles of religion. Bishops were instructed to visit their dioceses, adding the eleven articles to their own. In London, the examination of the beneficed clerg and their assistant curates, - but probably not the unbeneficed

---

1. Both dealt with baptism in a hand-basin rather than a font (ibid.vi,f.8r.; viii, f.39r.).
2. P.M.Dawley, John Whitgift And the Reformation (1955), 164.

lecturers[1] -, began in February, 1584.[2] Not a single outright refusal to subscribe has been recorded. Fifteen ministers made a qualified subscription; they agreed with the thirty-nine articles of religion "...for so much as concerneth faith and sacraments theren", and were prepared to observe the Prayer Book "...for the peace of the church, and if we be founde offendinge in any parte therof to submitt ourselves to the penalty of yt."[3] So mild was the qualification that the authorities apparently accepted it without demur, and not one of the fifteen had to suffer for his scruples.

A closer analysis of the fifteen ministers emphasises the weakness of nonconformist sentiment among the beneficed clergy, and the dependence of the radical cause on a small group of unattached lecturers. Only seven held livings in the City, and two of these were perpetual curates. Thomas White, William Davies, and Jonas Jerdfield were known semi-conformists, the first two more than once being in trouble for allowing inhibited preachers to use their pulpits.[4] Christopher Blithman was a parochial nominee;[5] John Haulton had served

---

1. Not one was included among the 'qualified' subscribers. (SP. i,221).
2. The first London subscription to appear in a list that survives at Lambeth was on Feb. 5th, 1584 (Lambeth Chartae Miscellanae, 13/60/f.2r.
3. SP.i,221. In one case only, the Christian name (Richard) has been recorded. Possibly this was Richard Young, curate at St. Dunstan West, and a known radical (LCCRO. Lib. Corr. 1583-6 -iv. f.20v.).
4. For White, see SP,ii,238 ; for Davies, GLMS.4409/1, f.4v.
5. He was PC. of St. Mary Aldermanbury.

his apprenticeship as a lecturer in that pioneering radical parish, St. Antholin.[1] The other two were newcomers, Thomas Hale being presented by Lord Windsor, and Arthur Bright by a City Alderman.[2] Bright, an ex-schoolmaster, was probably the most ardent radical in a London parsonage at this time; "ye wyll hang one day for yowr not kepyng the Boke of churche Religion", the Earl of Derby warned him some years later.[3] The other qualified subscribers were assistant clergy, generally to a non-resident incumbent;[4] their value to their cause was thus limited by their tenural insecurity. Neither the zeal of Bright and his associates nor the range of their activities, - some held preaching positions as well as their own livings -,[5] could conceal their lack of numbers. Not only had reputed Puritans like John Scarlet, John Johnson, and William Wager, apparently found no difficulty about subscribing, but the prospects of compensating for their loss by fresh recruitment to the beneficed ranks were becoming virtually minimal ■

---

1. GLMS. 9537/5 [no fol.].
2. Henn. 356, 389.
3. Quoted by Earl (CUL. Mm.1,29,f48.r.). Despite Derby's assertion, Bright had in fact subscribed outright in 1586 (Lambeth Chartae Miscellaenae 13/60/f.5r.)
4. They were George Closse (St. Magnus), William Wells (St. Stephen Coleman St), Francis Scarlet (St. Anne Blackfriars), Hugh Smith (St. Michael Cornhill), Richard Proctor (St. Botolph Billingsgate), William Arritage (Armitage) (St. Martin Iremonger), and John Brawler (St. Swithin).
5. cf. Appendix C.

as episcopal inspection of credentials pre-institution grew more rigorous.[1]

As in 1573-4 and, to a lesser extent, in 1566, the radicalism of the beneficed ministry had been put to the test and found wanting. But on this occasion the mainstay of the Puritan cause, the parish lecturer, was also subjected to discipline. The first to be examined may have been Thomas Barber who, after several years of active proselytism in the pulpits of St. Helen Bishopsgate, St. Mary Woolchurch, and more latterly, St. Mary Bow, was brought before the High Commissioners in June, 1584.[2] He proved recalcitrant, and was suspended forthwith for not subscribing. In the following March, Field, who had for four years been lecturing at St. Mary Aldermary, was examined at Fulham by Aylmer, Stanhope, and the vicar-general of the province, William Aubrey. Objections made by him to certain usages in the Prayer Book resulted in his inhibition from preaching, catechising or any other ecclesiastical function.[3] Stephen Egerton, who in 1583 had begun his long association with St. Anne Blackfriars, suffered the same fate; both he and Field were still suspended in 1585.[4] No record of proceedings against Cheston survives, but his disappearance from his lecturing posts

---

1. The first recorded candidate whom Aylmer refused to institute because he would not subscribe, was Ralph Haw en, presented to Frian in 1585 (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i,f.65r.)
2. SP. ii, 219.
3. Ibid. i, 283-4. Barber was still suspended in 1587 (ibid. ii,219).
4. Ibid. i, 284-6.

of 1583 at All Hallows Staining and St. Katherine Coleman suggests that he too was ejected.[1] In 1586, Travers lost his position as afternoon preacher at the Temple.[2] Of the leading radical preachers in City lectureships in 1583, only Charke, Crooke, and Edmunds do not appear to have been suspended at least temporarily. The former may have been protected by the extra-parochial position he held at Lincoln's Inn; Crooke survived both at St. Mary Woolchurch and at Gray's Inn possibly because his views were gradually moderating;[3] Edmunds was saved by the complete volte-face he committed, which enabled him to hold on to his preaching positions, and to be preferred to a lucrative benefice by a doubtless grateful archbishop.[4]

The consequences of Edmunds' volte-face were ultimately to be extremely serious, as he gave evidence against the Presbyterian leaders in the Star Chamber trial in 1591. The immediate survival of the London classis, however, was not mortally jeopardised by these ejections. Several still remained in London, and although finding it difficult to obtain a parochial platform, enjoyed some support from wealthy citizens whom they probably served as private tutors or catechisers. The Queen heard rumours of such activities in 1584, and soundly

---

1. He preached several sermons at St. Botolph Aldgate in early 1584, but not afterwards (GLMS. 9234/1, ff.5v, 25r
2. DNB.
3. Bancroft did not name him as a member of the 1584 Presbyterian synod not of the post-1586 meetings (Presbyterian Movement, 9-19 passim).
4. All Hallows Bread St. (1585).

rebuked Aylmer in his absence for "...looking no better into the City, where every merchant must have his schoolmaster and nightly conventicles, expounding scriptures and catechizing their servants and maids, insomuch that I have heard how some of their maids have not sticked to control learned preachers, and say that 'Such a man taught otherwise in our house'..."[1] Few of the ejected ministers could have failed to find a refuge with a sympathetic citizen or widow; legacies and private donations must have compensated somewhat for their loss of a regular stipend.[2]

Their cause was fortified by the infiltration into the capital of radical preachers from other parts of the country. Robert Openshaw came from Suffolk to enjoy a semi-clandestine existence doubtless as a private catechiser, occasionally emerging to perform a marriage service or deliver a sermon.[3] The man, Sibthorpe, who suddenly appeared as lecturer at St. Bartholomew Exchange in 1585 may possibly be the Robert Sibthorp associated with the Northampton classis.[4] George Gifford,

---

1. J.E.Neale, Queen Elizabeth (1934), 310.
2. e.g. will of Elizabeth Walter, proved Dec.23rd,1588 (Somerset House,PCC.15 Leicester). She left £10 each to, inter alia,Charke Travers, Wilcox; £6.13.4d. to Cheston; £5 each to Egerton,Barber and Cooper. £300 was to be spent on "...vertuous preachers...in any neede or in poore estate", at the discretion of her executors and Travers, Charke, Egerton and Wilcox. Richard Culverwell left money to Crowley, Charke, Travers, Field, Crooke, Crane, Edmunds, Cheston, and Sinclair,as well as £350 for them in time of need. (Probate Feb.18th, 1586, PCC. 10 Windsor.).
3. Tomlinson, op.cit.220.
4. Presbyterian Movement, xxix,; The VM. Books of St.Bartholomew Exchange, ed. E.Freshfield (1890), 17.

suspended from his Malden vicarage in 1584, preached at St. Botolph Aldgate two years later.[1] William Pegrim, after a turbulent year in a Hertfordshire curacy, even managed for a short time to secure a living in London.[2] A fragmentary exhibit from a case brought against him in the consistory ex officio domini indicates that an "...Assembly holden by the Assistants of the parishe" had been set up in 1587 by order of the vestry to examine the domestic problems of parishioners, and to administer disciplinary censure on offenders.[3] Henry Wotton, for instance, "...was called and reproved for his misdeameanour whoe shewed himself agreved for his ffawltes and promised amendment." Such activity was too evocative of the practice in a nonconformist presbytery to be ignored.[4] No similar behaviour in City parishes elsewhere can be traced, but the threat was evidently still real enough in 1601 to cause Bancroft to enquire whether parish officials did "...use a kind of presbytery or censuring over your neighbours under pretence of your vestry meetings."[5]

More substantial support for the radical cause came from

---

1. GLMS. 9234/1, f.18r.
2. He was rector of St. Olave Silver St. 1586-c.89. For his activities as curate at Sandridge, cf. Records of the Old Archdeaconry of St. Albans, ed. H.R.Wilton Hall (St. Albans, 1908), 51.
3. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, 1,f.205r.
4. Shortly afterwards, the living was vacant through the cession of Pegrim. Possibly he deserted to avoid deprivation. He became vicar of a Suffolk living in 1589 (Alumni Cantab. 1, iii, 327).
5. Kennedy, op.cit,iii,348.

the influx of Scottish Presbyterian ministers into London between 1584-6 following the episcopalian reaction in Scotland. The bulk of the leaders arrived in the summer of 1584; the funeral of one of their number, James Lawson, in the October of that year was attended by at least a dozen Scot ministers, including Andrew Melville, John Davidson, and Walter Balcanquhal.[1] Some lodged in Honey Lane, where a child of Balcanquhal was baptised in 1585;[2] a principal patron appears to have been Anthony Martin who lived in that parish, and in whose house Lawson died.[3]

Their arrival in London was much welcomed by Field and his associates. At a general conference held in 1584, a resolution was passed to make collections for the relief of the Scottish ministers.[4] A number of leading London Puritans were present at Lawson's funeral.[5] Three of the Scotsmen, - possibly Melville, Balcanquhal, and Davidson -, participated in the ministerial conferences arranged at the houses of Field and Barber at this time.[6] Opportunities for public preaching were not bright, and at one time a suggestion was made to establish a separate Scottish church in London on the model of the Dutch church.[7] A

---

1. Addit. MS. 4736, f.166v.
2. Register, 105 (Oct.22nd/1585).
3. Addit. MS. 4736, f.166v. Martin is described as a potter in the funeral account.
4. Donaldson, op.cit. 185. cf. his Appendix 'A' for a list of Scottish ministers in England during the reign.
5. They included Charke, Gardiner, Travers, Crooke, Barber, Wood, Egerton, Field, and Edmunds. Also present were three ministers of the French church in London. In all, "above 500 persons" attended the funeral.
6. SP. i, 284.
7. Donaldson, op.cit. 192.

few of them, however, did manage to obtain a pulpit. Andrew Melville preached in the Tower, at a church exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, through the friendliness of the Lieutenant.[1] Balcanquhal also preached regularly in 1584, possibly at All Hallows Honey Lane. The most popular preacher was probably John Davidson who delivered a number of sermons between 1584-6 at St. Olave Jewry, where the sympathetic vicar, at the pressure of his parishioners, defied episcopal vetoes until eventually he was suspended and his church-wardens excommunicated.[2]

With the co-operation of the Scots, the activities of the London Presbyterian group intensified post-1584. As most of the members were now denied a public platform, their campaigning was literary, or in a clandestine personal capacity. Their growing extremism may have been accelerated by their enforced conspiratorial activity as well as by the failure to obtain reform by more moderate ways of petitions to Parliament and literary propaganda. It was decided about this time, said Thomas Edmunds, that "...every man should labor by all the meanes he could to bringe in the said reformacion themselves."[3] Certain resolutions, declaring unlawful the "...presente government of the Church of England", and advocating the substitution of government "...by pastors doctors elders and deacons", were passed, and members were required to subscribe

---

1. Ibid. 192.
2. GLMS. 4409/1, f.4v.
3. PRO. Star Chamber 5, A 49/34, f.5r.

to these tenets.[1] Edmunds, "...mislikinge of these Courses", left the group, but its campaigning as the central link in what was now a widespread organisation covering a number of counties, intensified.[2] A national synod was convened in London in 1584, and from about 1586 onwards similar meetings were periodically held at the homes of Gardiner, Egerton, Travers, and Barber.[3] The reasonably accurate 'Survey of the London Ministry' was drawn up, probably by members of the London group, in the early summer of 1586.[4] The key-man in the organisation of the group, as of the whole movement, was undoubtedly Field, with Travers as the principal theoretician, to whom points of procedure were referred.[5]

Despite the general acquiescence of the beneficed clergy, the influx of Scots, the infiltration of ministers ejected from country areas, and the feverish activity of the clandestine Presbyterian brotherhood, produced an ecclesiastical atmosphere in London more disturbed and restless than at any time since 1566.[6] "But you Londoners," cried Whitgift in 1587, "are so given to novelties that if there be one man more new then another, him will you have," and many were those who echoed his

---

1. A list of subscribers to the Book of Discipline is given by D.Neal, The History of the Puritans (1822), i, 387 (note). Londoners named were Travers, Charke, Egerton, Gardiner, Field, Seyntcler (Sinclair), Standen, Wilcox, and Barber.
2. Presbyterian Movement, 9.
3. Ibid. 19.
4. SP. ii, 180-4; cf. supra, pp.152-3.
5. Presbyterian Movement, 13.
6. SP. ii, 227.

sentiments.[1] The localisation of the Puritan cause into pockets such as the Minories, Whitechapel, Blackfriars, and St. Antholin, exacerbated a problem that had long existed,—the difficulty of enforcing citizens to attend their own parishes as prescibed by law, rather than desert elsewhere to hear sermons by a preacher whose views conformed with their own. The issue aroused much literary discussion;[2] it was taken further when parishioners, refusing to receive the communion at the hands of their own ministers, partook of it elsewhere, accounting "...the Sacrament to be the better which is ministred by one Minister more then by an other."[3] Aylmer took steps at his visitations against the most persistent offenders,[4] and in 1588 issued inhibitions to the minister and church-wardens of the Blackfriars and Whitechapel against allowing any but their own parishioners to receive communion at their church.[5] In a city of such a teeming population, however, the problem was probably insurmountable.

The restlessness of the day was reflected in the

---

1. cf. Lawrence Barker, Christs Checke to S Peter (1599): "O ye fond and foolish giddie-headed Londoners, who hath besotted your soules and understandings, that thus you estrange your selves from sound doctrine and holie exhortations, and are so vainly inamored on every new found trifle..." (Sig. M4, f.2r.).
2. e.g. Sophronistes: A Dialogue (1589) [Anon.]. Very probably, London forms the background to this conversation.
3. This was Aylmer's complaint. (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i, f.229r.).
4. Among those who admitted going to Blackfriars rather than their own church in the 1589 visitation, was Thomas Lancaster, a schoolmaster in Shoe Lane (St. Bride), who was involved in the Hacker conspiracy (GLMS. 9537/7, f.108r.).
5. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i, f.229r. (July 6th/1588). The attractions in these parishes of course were Egerton and Richard Gardiner.

acrimoniousness of the discussions, and the bitterness of the relations between the orthodox clergy who dominated the City pulpits and the much harried nonconformists whose opportunities for parochial ventilation of their opinions was limited to a few churches and occasional illicit sermons elsewhere. "Si tu habes duplex beneficium, tu non es dignus, hoc digito quamvis peccatoris"; so did Giles Wigginton express his opinion of the pluralist rector of St. Mary Bow.[1] Physical violence was alleged at St. Alphage following a quarrel between the church-wardens about allowing a preacher, who refused to exhibit his licence, to enter the church pulpit.[2] Uproar was created in the Tower church by the aspersions of the loyalist, Richard Mathew, against noble patrons of the nonconformist cause.[3] Offence taken by the same Mathew against a sermon delivered by John Wilson, a preacher from Yorkshire, who tarried for a time at All Hallows Less, led to the arrest of the latter.[4] Richard Benbow, the Puritan curate of St. Antholin, complained to the bishop about the suspect opinions of Hugh Broughton, likewise a nonconformist, but of a more unorthodox nature.[5]

Typical of the controversial atmosphere was the incident in Paul's churchyard in early 1589 described by Lionel Foster, an

---

1. SP. ii, 246.
2. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1586-91 [no fol.] (Officium domini promotum per James Sherman v. Roger Hawksworth).
3. PRO. SP. 12/202/13. Some of the 'noble men', alleged Mathew, gave £40 a year "...to maintain some of the prescissians againste the Queene."
4. SP. ii, 225.
5. Bodl. MS. Tanner 79, f.92r. and v. I am indebted to Dr.P. Collinson for this reference.

Essex incumbent.[1] Following his institution by the bishop, he had, armed with his ecclesiastical instruments, visited a stationer in the churchyard. Near the stall, he was accosted by a man "...whoe lokinge in [his] wrightings and seinge by his testimoniall that he had subscribed to the booke of articles seemed to blame [him]...[and] did urge [him] with speaches concerninge his subscription..." But Foster was not to be persuaded, asserting that he found no fault in the Prayer Book, "...excepte yt be baptisinge of Children by woemen."

The conspiratorial air of intrigue suggested by persistent anonymous canvassing of this kind, probably reached its tensest phase with the publication of the Marprelate tracts and the frantic search for the printing press. Martin was quick to exploit the tension:"...watch me Paul's Churchyard," he advised the pursuivants,[2] "especially have an eye to Boyle's shop at the Rose...go in thither, and if there be any strangers in the shop, fall in [to] talk with them of Martin, commend him..." A visit to the favourite preaching rendezvous of radicals, Blackfriars, Lincoln's Inn, Paul's Chain, and Whitechapel, would be valuable. "Especially,mark if you see any before the sermon begins setting

---

1. LCCRO. Lib. Examin. 1586-91 [no fol.]. The deposition (dated April 19th, 1589) was made by Foster, who was rector of Little Tay, and vicar of Great Tay, in a case brought against him for alleged morality and nonconformity.
2. The Just Censure and Reproofe (1589); printed in The Marprelate Tracts, 1588, 1589, ed. W.Pierce (1911), 355.

their heads together, and whispering under their cloaks. If you do, be sure they are reading Martin."

The extravagance of religious ferment engendered by the controversies of these years, precipitated, among more apocalyptic outbreaks of divine revelation,[1] a revival of that separatism which in London had to all appearances been dormant,- apart from the Nash episode of 1580[2] -, since the first decade of the reign. The impetus was provided byRobert Browne's appointment, on terms, as master of St. Olave Southwark in November, 1586.[3] Later congregationalists attributed their conversion to his sermons, clandestinely delivered on such unconsecrated ground as a gravel-pit near Islington.[4] A conventicle, which included among its numbers the veteran Nicholas Crane, was discovered in St. Andrew Wardrobe parish in 1587.[5] Periodic arrests were made in the following few years, the largest Brownist congregation detected being that of Francis Johnson which worshipped in a house in St. Nicholas Lane, and whose numbers varied from sixty to a hundred.[6] In 1590, "... divers fantasticall persons whoe utterly refuse to communicate

---

1. The best known was the Hacker-Coppinger conspiracy of 1591.
2. SP. i, 147-52. Nash claimed that there had been "...at the least a thousand persons in this city of London, that ere well bent and godly minded..." But cf. Peel, op.cit. 44-5.
3. The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne, ed. A.Peel and L.H.Carlson, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, ii (1953), 7.
4. C.Burrage, The Early English Dissenters 1550-1641 (1912),i, 119.
5. Ibid. 119-21.
6. Ibid. 141-2.

with our Churche in publique prayer administracon of the Sacraments and preachinge" were found to be using the new churchyard founded by Thomas Rowe near Bedlam Hospital,[1] for the burial of their dead, "...moste unreverently tumblinge them into the pit digged for them." Alarmed by such irreverential non-observance of the Prayer Book, the High Commissioners instructed the keeper of the churchyard to check the names and parishes of all burial parties, and to refuse access to those who brought neither a minister nor the Prayer Book with them.[2] Brownism was tolerated neither by the authorities nor by the non-separating nonconformists, although several of the members of the captured conventicle of 1592 attributed their views to the influence of leading London Puritans.[3]

Except for a few preachers whose noble patronage doubtless gave them privileges,[4] the London nonconformist clergy suffered, like the separatists, from a policy of unmitigated suppression on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities. Martin Marprelate could mock at their inquisitorial methods, but he could name only four Puritan preaching strongholds in 1589.[5] While speculation,

---

1. Founded in 1569, the graveyard had been a favourite sanctuary for Puritans as well as separatists. Edward Dering was buried there (cf. GLMS. 9051/4, f.90v), as was the Scottish Presbyterian James Lawson (Addit. MS 4736, f.166v.).
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i, f.343r. The order was signed by Whitgift, Aylmer, Buckhurst, the bishop of Lincoln, Anderson, Francis, Gawdy, Cosin, John Still, Aubery, Goodman, Bancroft, Lewin, Stanhope.
3. Most frequently named were Egerton, Cooper, Wigginton, Gardiner and Edward Phillips (Burrage, op.cit.ii,37-59, passim).
4. Richard Gardiner kept his living in Whitechapel until his death in 1617, although he was a member of the London classis. His patron must have exerted considerable influence on Aylmer.
5. Marprelate Tracts, 355.

pamphleteering, lobbying, and, at times, physical disturbances, provoked an atmosphere of intense friction in the city, the policies of Whitgift, Aylmer, and their associates were undermining nonconformist resistance in the parish pulpits. The brittleness of the position of clerical Puritanism in London was exposed at the very time when nonconformist activities reached their climax.

c) Anglicanism Ascendant.

The long-term key to the moderation of the London clergy,- the distribution of patronage,- is discussed elsewhere.[1] Whitgift and Aylmer had so exploited the valuable livings in their gift, and exerted their influence elsewhere, that a powerful nucleus of ecclesiastical chaplains, selected as well for the discrimination of their views as for their academic distinction, had been installed in many of the principal City benefices. The names of the panel appointed by Whitgift in 1558 for "...the perusal and allowing of..." printed books which by a Star Chamber decree of 1586, required the approval of archbishop or bishop of London before publication,[2] give some indication of both the orthodoxy and importance of leading City incumbents. Nine, - probably ten -,[3] of the dozen named, held one or more

---

1. Chapters III and VI.
2. W.W.Gregg, Some Aspects And Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650 (1956), 9,52.
3. In ne case, only the surname (Cole) was given. He was probably Humphrey Cole, R. of St. Mary Bow, and chaplain to Whitgift.

livings in the City,[1] and all but one were chaplains either to Whitgift or Aylmer. The exception was Robert Crowley, whose selection reflected the moderation of his views, since his restoration to Cripplegate in 1578.[2] The composition of the panel illustrates the reliance of the ecclesiastical authorities on London incumbents in the application of their policy of uniformity.

The maintenance of discipline, however, demanded more immediate measures. Aylmer effected them by improving the existing machinery of clerical discipline and by cutting down the loopholes through which a nonconformist preacher could obtain a pulpit. With regard to the first task, the ultimate sanctions, - excommunication, suspension, sequestration, and deprivation -, had never ceased to be effective against the clergy, as the experiences of 1566 had borne out; the growing indifference of the laity to censures which were only spiritual in form, can be contrasted with the susceptibility of the clergy to sanctions which struck at their temporal as well as spiritual well-being. The difficulty lay in the detection of clerical irregularities more than in the limitations of ecclesiastical censure.

Much had been effected by Whitgift's transformation of the High Commission, and by extending the activities of pursuivants

---

1. Stallard, Wood, and Judson were archiepiscopal chaplains; Gravett, Cotton, Hutchinson, Tripp, and Dickens were chaplains to Aylmer.
2. Long associated with the Stationers Co., he became a freeman by redemption in 1578 (Gregg, op.cit. 47).

and apparitors.[1] At the same time, the visitational machinery was improved. Since Grindal's time, visitation articles in London had been issued at the visitation itself rather than beforehand, when the citations to attend were delivered.[2] Parish officials were then given a period, usually three or four weeks, in which to prepare their bills of presentment.[3] By this practice, officials generally had more time to complete their bills, and moreover, did so after swearing their oaths of impartial inquiry and detection at the session. Aylmer added to this in 1586 by requiring officials to complete a second set of answers to his articles,[4] the number of which were greater than any since Bonner's time.[5] A similar checking process was introduced by Aylmer with the injunctions issued at the close of the visitation session; incumbents were instructed to certify annually to the archdeacon to their observance of the injunctions and officials presented any instances of neglect at the following visitation.[6] In other respects, checks were made on

---

1. Dawley, op.cit. 164.
2. e.g. the wardens of St. Mary Macdalene Milk St. received their book of articles from the bishop at his visitation in 1577 (GLMS. 2596/1, f.164v.).
3. e.g. 1574 visitation; articles delivered August 11-13; bills exhibited Sept. 20th
   1583 " " "August 29-31;" Sept. 26th
   1598 " " "Octbr. 20- 7;" Nov. 29th
4. Kennedy, op.cit. iii, 208.
5. Known totals read: Bonner (1554): 124 Aylmer (1583): 68
   Sandys (1571): 43 " (1586): 75
   Aylmer (1577): 60 Fletcher (1595): 84
   " (1580): 74 Bancroft (1601): 70
6. Kennedy, op.cit. iii, 203.

the quality of bills of presentment. Unsatisfactory or incomplete returns were rejected, - nine suffered this fate in 1586 [1] -, or church-wardens were cited before the consistory court to "...informe their bill more particularly in that which is rased." [2]

Despite such refinements, the presentment system could only be of limited value in detecting nonconformist activity in parishes where the incumbent had the approval, and often the active encouragement, of his parishioners, for his irregularitie Where conviction clashed with an obligation undertaken on oath, the latter did not always prevail. Aylmer's appreciation of the vulnerability of the system may have explained the practice, tha apparently occurred most often in his visitations of 1586 and later, of a direct examination of a clergyman's conformability. [4] By these means, certain ministers were warned in 1586 of the consequences of their tendency to lend out their pulpits to unlicensed preachers. [5] In 1589, information was elicited that three incumbents did not consistently wear their surplices at

---

1. GLMS. 9537/6, passim.
2. GLMS. 9537/8, f.79r.
3. In 1586, officials of two Essex parishes were summoned befor the chancellor "quod omiserunt presentere that the minister wereth not the surples." (GLMS. 9537/6, f.93r.).
4. At least, a record of such examination only began to be written into the visitation book in 1586.
5. GLMS. 9537/6, ff.110r, 117r, 122r.

the prescribed services,[1] and three lecturers were found to have failed to participate in the communion service as required by the privy council orders of 1580.[2] Inspection of preaching licences at the visitation was another way of ascertaining clerical orthodoxy after 1585, when subscription was first required before the grant of a licence.[3] The Scotsman, Duncan Anderson, failed to produce his credentials in 1586, and was referred to the archbishop for further examination.[4]

Efficient as visitational technique may have been during the Aylmer-Stanhope partnership, its value was inevitably limited by its temporary nature, as a minimum of three years' interval between episcopal visitations was compulsory.[5] In the early part of his episcopate, Aylmer had reduced the vacuum by frequent examinations of the clergy at a central church by what were in some ways de facto visitations;[6] post-1586, he placed more reliance on closing the loopholes by which nonconformists had secured preaching platforms.

---

1. GLMS. 9537/7, ff.103v, 104v, 106v.
2. Ibid. f.103v. Information elicited at the same visitation led to a vigorous attempt to re-instate fonts in churches where they had been displaced. (GLMS. 1046/1, f.38r; 645/1, f.234r; 2596/1, f.190v.; 4457/2, f.22r.; 1016/1 [no fol.]; 4409/1, f.13r
3. Supra, pp.168-71.
4. GLMS. 9537/6, f.118v.
5. Apart from a four year gap between 1561-5, the Elizabethan bishops of London visited regularly every three years.
6. The City clergy were particularly harassed in 1579-80, being summoned before the bishop or the Ecclesiastical Commissioners seven times within a period of fifteen months. (Strype, Aylmer, 51-53, passim.).

Subscription to the three archiepiscopal articles had been enforced on prospective London ordinands since 1584,[1] and, in specific instances, on applicants for preaching licences since 1585. Clergymen presented to livings in the diocese, and who had not previously subscribed, were likewise required to do so, and Aylmer on several occasions did not hesitate to refuse to institute a man reluctant to subscribe. This happened to Ralph Hawden, a well-known Essex Puritan who was presented to the rectory of Gingefraim in 1585.[2] Seven years later, John Smith, a lecturer at St. Paul's cathedral, who had been presented to the vicarage of Clavering, was refused institution and inhibited from preaching for the same reason.[3] Three weeks later, Smith reappeared before the bishop, and was instituted on entering into an obligation of £20 to subscribe within three months.[4]

Rigorously enforced, subscription largely disposed of the possibility of nonconformist infiltration into London livings and regular curacies. To a lesser degree, it likewise barred their promotion to lecturing positions. There remained, however the problem of the unattached Puritan minister drifting casually about the City pulpits, and preaching where invited by sympathetic parish officials, or where he was offered the loan of the pulpit by the regular parish lecturer. So fashionable

---

1. GLMS. 9535/2, f.24r.
2. LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, i,f.65r. For Hawden's Puritanism, cf. SP.ii,164-5,258,260.
3. LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1589-93, f.289v. (August 29th,1592).
4. Ibid, f.290v.

a refuge had the capital become to the Scotsman and the harried rural radical as well as the ejected local minister, that the activities of the casual preacher could never be finally subdued. Some restraint, however, could be effected by repeated instructions to parish officials to allow no strange minister to enter their pulpit without exhibiting his preaching licence,[1] and by the periodic issue of injunctions against unlicensed preachers. Three times, is appears, a commission against preachers "...some of them not beinge Ministers, others such as have no sufficient warrante for their callinge, and others such as have been detected in other countreys, and have notwithstanding in the Citie taken upon them to preache publiquely to the infamy of their callinge", was issued by Aylmer between 1586-9.[2] According to a Puritan critic, three of the most persistent offenders, Wigginton, Wilson, and the Scot, Davidson, were actually named in the 1587 commission.[3] Earlier, there appears to have been a specific injunction agains the unlicensed Scottish preachers in London.[4]

The experiences of John Smith, a radical young Oxford

---

1. A dispute between the church-wardens of St. Alphage on this very point led to blows and a suit in the consistory court in 1590 (LCCRO. Lib. Act. 1589-93, f.75v. et seq.).
2. The first was on December 7th, 1586; the second August 16th, 1587; and the third March 26th, 1589. For details, supra, pp 179-81
3. SP. ii, 231. But see the footnote for a contradiction.
4. So Earl recorded in his notebook. (CUL.MS.Mm,1,29,f.46v.). He dated it in 1585.

preacher, give some indication of the efficiency of Aylmer's 'screening' arrangements.[1] In need of funds to complete his university course, Smith planned to spend a year in a London lectureship worth £40 or so. Aylmer evidently heard of his intentions, and, aware of his radical inclinations, refused him admission to a City pulpit, so that Smith "...I fear me must be constrayned to looke into the countrye." Likewise, the failure of a scheme devised by parishioners of Christ Church, to endow a lectureship for Richard Greenham from funds intended to maintain four singing priests in the church, may have been due to Aylmer's veto.[2]

A critic of nonconformity, writing on "The Distressed State of the Church of England by Division", analysed the composition of the London clergy about 1589, grading them into five divisions according to the shades of their Protestantism.[3] Although his list was far from complete,[4] the picture he gave is a commentary on the brittleness of the nonconformist position in London at a time when the national movement was at its height

---

1. Corpus Christi College Oxford, 318, f.143v. (circa 1588). I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr. Collinson.
2. St. Barts. Hospital Rec. Office, Ha.1/3, f.109v.
3. PRO. SP. 12/93/8, 629-32. The document is anonymous; possibly the author was a London clergyman of the orthodox group. It is undated, but references to Thomas Colfe who became R. of St. Mary Botham in 1588, and to William Pegrim who ceded his living in 1589, and the absence of a reference to John Field who died in March, 1588, indicate that it was written in late 1588 or early 1589. Its tentative dating is 1573 in the Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1547-80, 470, is obviously wrong.
4. None of the archiepiscopal peculiars, for instance, was included.

The incumbents of forty-five City churches were included in the first classification, that of "The obedient protestants". Next to them were the "demi-pure", those that "...obey in parte to please all, to wynne gayne, and credit and preach and minister to please the effections of their parishioners and subscribe and promyse to parforme and take their oths of ecclesiastical obedience to kepe their livinges and with the protestant a protestant, and with the puritane al peevish and precise and tell them they did but subscribe conditionally and agreeable to the word."[1] Sixteen City incumbents,[2] three assistant curates and two unattached lecturers[4] came under this label. Of the third and fourth types, those that held no benefice, took no oath, refused to subscribe, but preached lectures or catechised in private houses,[5] the writer could name only nine, two of whom

---

1. SP. 12/93/8, 632.
2. White (V. of St. Dunstan); Foster (V. of St. Bride); Coren (R. of St. Peter Paul's Wharf); Heaz (PC. of St.Botolph Aldgate) Pegrim (R. of St. Olave Silver St.); Edmunds (R. of All Hallows Bread St.); Castleton (R. of St.Martin Iremonger); Thorpe (R. of St. Christopher le Stocks); Wager (R. of St. Benet Gracechurch and St. Michael Queenhithe); Gattacre (R. of St. Edmund Lombard St.); Greene (R. ofSt. Michael Bassishaw); Dee (R. of St.Barts. Great); Jackson (R. of St. Swithin); Haulton (Houghton) (PC. of St. Lawrence Pountney); Hailes (R. of St. Clement Eastcheap); and Scarlet (St. Barts. Exchange).
3. Salt (Christ Church); Pratt (St. Peter West Cheap); Brown (St. Thomas Apostle ?).
4. Anderson (St. Katherine Cree); Stile (All Hallows Barking).
5. Charke, Travers, Crooke, Egerton, Benbow, Scott, Henry Smith, a lecturer at St. Antholin with 'one eye', and a lecturer in Southwark with 'the wooden leg'.

were outside the area under study,[1] adding "...with many others wanderers and rangers abowt London." His final list of the "most pure", the separatists, included only one clergyman known to have been associated with a City parish.[2]

(iv) THE TWILIGHT OF NONCONFORMITY, 1592-1603.

The activities of Puritan clergy in London in the 1590s were spasmodic and localised, the only evidence of any concerted action on a substantial scale being the support given to the Earl of Essex in 1599-1600. Even more than in the previous decade, the Puritan cause was dependent on the lectureship, and survived in those pockets least amenable to ecclesiastical discipline. St. Antholin, Paul's Chain, Blackfriars, and the Minories tenaciously clung to their radical tradition until by the last years of the reign, the twilight was at length tinged with a glimmer of dawn, if only because larger endowments were stabilising lectureships, and the purchase of impropriations by parishioners was making possible new and important pockets of nonconformity.[3]

Bancroft's detective work, and the trial of Cartwright and his associates in 1591 had exposed the clandestine activities of the Presbyterian nucleus of London ministers over the preceding twenty years. In fact, the group had probably already

---

1. Smith and the Southwark preacher.
2. Nicholson (cf. Tomlinson, op.cit. 220).
3. Supra, pp. 359-61

lost much of its dynamism with the defection of Wilcox and the irremediable loss of Field in 1588.[1] Although the London homes of some of the members had provided the venue of the Presbyterian assemblies of 1586-90,[2] not one of the survivors of the group was among the leaders of the movement imprisoned by the Star Chamber Barber and the ex-member, Thomas Edmunds, appeared as witnesses, the latter deposing valuable evidence for the Crown.[3] The only Londoner to be imprisoned appears to have been Stephen Egerton who spent three years in the Fleet after his examination by the High Commission in 1590.[4] Charke was suspended in 1593,[5] and Barber may not have been re-issued with a preaching licence until 1596,[6] but on the whole the contrast between the moderation of their treatment and the penalties prescribed to classical leader elsewhere, suggests that the dominant influences in the movement may have drifted away from the London group following the death of Field.[7]

---

1. Field died in March, 1588.
2. Presbyterian Movement, 19.
3. Scott Pearson, op.cit. 332.
4. DNB.
5. Ibid.
6. The wardens of St.Botolph Bishopsgate entreated Barber to preach with them in 1593, and eventually he received 40/- for delivering 5 sermons (GLMS. 4524/1, f.84r.). A Thomas Barber,M.A was granted a licence March 28th, 1596, at the testimony of Dr. Giles Fletcher, a patron of London Puritans (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope,iii,f.70v.).
7. Of the nine prisoners who petitioned Burghley in 1591, Fenn, Wight,and Lord were from Warwickshire; Snape, Proudlove, and King from Northamptonshire, Jewel from Devon, and Payne from Staffordshire. The other was Cartwright who had been Master of a Warwick hospital since 1585 (Scott Pearson, op.cit. 332).

With several of the leading radicals active throughout the decade, and with Egerton returning to the Blackfriars on his release in 1593, it is not improbable that some form of ministerial assocation survived the collapse of the national movement in 1590-1. The evidence, however, is extremely nebulous. Most suggestive was the letter written to the parishioners of St. Botolph Aldgate in October 1597 on behalf of a distressed citizen, and signed, inter alia, by Barber, Gardiner, and Edward Phillips, three of the leading Puritans of the day.[1] The tendency to find the same names grouped together as beneficiaries in wills made by Puritan-minded citizens at this time, is also suggestive. Thomas Spering named as his overseers in 1591 Egerton, Cooper, and Phillips.[2] Sir Wolstan Dixie in 1592 left money to "...Mr. Phillips and the rest of the brethren."[3] Richard Gall, a haberdasher, made legacies of £5 to Egerton and Phillips, and donated 40/- each to the 'next gathering' of Egerton, Cooper, Phillips, and Richard Gardiner.[4] Angelo Victorio in 1593 made Charke and Egerton responsible for the disposal of a legacy to "...a poor scholar of divinity...an Englishe man a lover of the doctrine of life and course of Christe."[5] William Jackson, who was to be deprived for

---

1. GLMS. 9234/7, f.10r.
2. LCCRO. Cons. Ct. Regr., Spering, f.1r.
3. Somerset House, PCC. 1 Dixie.
4. GLMS. 9171/18, f.171v. (dated Feb. 25th, 1594).
5. Ibid. f.327v.

nonconformity in 1605, was first associated with Barber's name in John Heaton's testament of 1598.[1] Thomas Ridge, citizen and grocer, left money for a lecture at St. Benet Gracechurch in the same year, provided the preacher was appointed by his overseers; the four overseers turned out to be Egerton, Charke, Phillips, and Anthony Wotton, the last an important recruit to the radical cause.[2] Donations of this kind reflected the survival of a radical group in London, a group which formed an important link between the Presbyterianism of the late 1580s and the revival of nonconformist activity on the accession of James.

Their numbers, if not their influence, were small. Cooper can probably be identified with the lecturer of that name at St. Alphage from 1590-1603.[3] Phillips built up a preaching reputation at St. Saviour's, Southwark.[4] Charke for a time lectured at St. Mary Aldermary, Field's old pulpit.[5] Egerton remained in the Blackfriars, and by the close of the century was perhaps the most celebrated preacher in London.[6] The

---

1. Somerset House, PCC. 74 Lewyn.
2. Ibid. PCC. 1, 2 Kidd.
3. GLMS. 1432/3, ff.35v. et seq. For the probable identificati see supra, p.404, note 1
4. A volume of his sermons was published after his death by Sir Henry Yelverton from notes taken during their delivery (Knappen, op.cit. 270).
5. GLMS. 6574, f.3v.
6. Lady Ann Hoby was a frequent attender of his sermons when in London (Diary of Lady Hoby, ed. Dorothy Meads (1930), 150-164, passim.

veteran, George Cheston, attached at one time to St. Thomas Hospital,[1] appears to have revived his association with the Minories in 1595;[2] he was still active in London in 1610.[3] Barber's whereabouts are not known. The loss suffered by the departure of Travers to Dublin in 1594 was somewhat compensated later by the return of Eusebius Paget to London. For some time a schoolmaster at Deptford, he was appointed lecturer at St. Botolph Aldgate in August, 1598, remaining there for at least ~~two~~ four years, and possibly until his collation to the rectory of St. Anne and St. Agnes in 1604.[4] In 1596, Anthony Wotton started on his long and active career in the Puritan cause, first as divinity lecturer in Gresham College, and then for over twenty-five years preacher at All Hallows Barking.[5] Richard Greenham and George Phillips, Puritan in principle but less controversial in action, also adorned London pulpits for a part of the decade.[6]

The divorce between the radicalism of several of the parish lecturers and the beneficed clergy persisted. The death of

---

1. He was thus specified in the will of Elizabeth Walter, dated 1588 (Somerset House, PCC. 15 Leicester).
2. Tomlinson, op.cit. 211.
3. The Transcript of the Registers...of St. Mary Woolnoth and St. Mary Woolchurch, ed. J.M.S. Brooke and A.W.C.Hallen (1886), 349.
4. GLMS. 9234/7, f.135r; cf. Appendix C.
5. DNB.
6. Greenham preached at Christ Church until his death in 1594 (Appendix C). Phillips was lecturer in St. Edmund Lombard St. in 1490, and was still in London in 1599 (Appendix C). For Greenham's views cf. W.Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York, 1938), 269.

Thomas Gattacre, John Scarlet, Thomas Spering, and William Davie early in the decade, deprived the movement of important links that had previously existed between the semi-conformists and the more extreme wing. Occasionally, a suitable substitute infiltrated into the beneficed ranks. Arthur Bright was actually preferred by Aylmer to St. Botolph Bishopsgate, probabl through the influence of Hutchinson, an episcopal chaplain, who secured Bright's previous living for himself.[1] John Downham obtained the vicarage of St. Olave Jewry in 1599 on the commendation of William Davison.[2] Among the perpetual curacies, William Hubbock, chastened by his skirmish with the authorities, was donated to St. Peter in the Tower in 1593;[3] David English, one of the few surviving Scottish members in London post-1590, and an associate of the Presbyterian divine, Andrew Melville,[4] served for a time in the Minories, and later at Creechurch and the Blackfriars.[5]

Neither their representation nor their influence was far-reaching in the London of the nineties, a p riod that saw the fruits of that discrimination followed by ecclesiastical

---

1. This was the rectory of Castle Camps, Cambridgeshire (A. Gibbons, Ely Episcopal Records (Lincoln 1891), 447).
2. Bodl. MS. Tanner 179, f.42v.
3. cf. DNB. for an account of his troubles.
4. During English's absence in Scotland in 1597, Melville wrote on his behalf to Stanhope, excusing his non-residence on the grounds of illness (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, f.154r.).
5. David Clem, another Scottish minister, died in English's home in 1597 (GLMS. 9234/6, f.254v.).

patrons during the previous decade. It was the high-noon of Anglicanism, with a dozen future bishops serving their apprenticeship in City pulpits,[1] with potential archdeacons and present collegiate principals widely interspersed in City parsonages, and with Bancroft and Lancelot Andrewes the dominant clerical personalities of the day.[2] Where the ecclesiastical state prospered, with graduates and authorised preachers in all but a handful of livings, there was little scope for Puritan criticism of existing clerical standards.

The outward innocuity of their activities may account for the greater measure of toleration enjoyed by the London Puritans during the decade. Little concession was shown towards extremists like Wildblood[3] and Nicholson[4] in the Minories, and the lecturer at St. Augustine in 1597 who can perhaps be identified as Henry Jacob.[5] Their tenure was short-lived, but others

---

1. cf. Chapter III.
2. Bancroft was rector of St. Andrew Holborn until his consecration as bishop of London in 1597. Andrewes was vicar of St. Giles Cripplegate, canon-residentiary of St. Paul's, and Official of the diocese during the episcopal vacancy following Aylmer's death. (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.186r.).
3. Wildblood was a preacher in the Minories 1589 (Tomlinson, op.cit. 220), and shortly afterwards was vicar of Redbourne. In 1591 he was suspended from the latter position by Stanhope; possibly he lost his Minories' post at the same time (LCCRO.Lib. VG. Stanhope, ii, f.39v.). By 1593, he was a chaplain to Lady Anne Bacon at Gorhambury (Collinson, op.cit. 1179).
4. Nicholson was described as a separatist in a hostile libel (SP. 12/93/8). He died in 1593. (Tomlinson, op.cit. 220).
5. His Christian name is not given in the citation inhibiting him from preaching (LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, iii, f.161v.) Henry Jacob was in England at the time (DNB).

survived largely undisturbed. Cooper preached for twelve years at St. Alphage without interruptions;[1] Paget, after some preliminary trouble due to his being unlicensed,[2] was active in St. Botolph Aldgate for at least ~~two~~ four years, though his practice of appointing deputies to preach in his place caused some anxiety Even Egerton appears to have been tolerated post-1593; at Bancroft's visitation of 1598 he escaped with an admonition to observe the Anglican rites.[4] Three years later. the bishop wrote to Cecil that Egerton was the only persistent nonconformist he had traced in London, and that other ministers had in fact complained of his behaviour.[5] Only Edward Phillips apparently was harshly treated, being imprisoned for a short time in 1596 by the High Commissioners for changing the day of an appointed fast.[6] The action taken by the commission in 1595, when four preaching positions at Christ Church were abolished, and the endowment diverted to its original purpose of maintaining singing priests, was also a mild setback to the radical cause, as several semi-conforming Puritans had enjoyed lectureships there over the past fifteen years.[7]

Not until the illness of Essex in 1599 and his subsequent

---

1. Appendix C.
2. GLMS. 9537/9, f.181r.
3. Supra, p.419
4. GLMS. 9537/9, f.158r.
5. HMC. Hatfield MSS. xi, 154.
6. Lansd. MS. 83, f.98r.
7. e.g. Francis Scarlet, Gattacre, Wells, Dee. For the order, su St. Barts. Hosp. Rec. Office, Ha.1/3, f.144v.

activities in the capital, did the London clergy cause the authorities any serious anxiety. During the preceding decade, the earl had built up a substantial clerical following in the city, among both beneficed ministers and unattached lecturers. By no means all of them were Puritans; David Roberts, rector of St. Andrew Wardrobe,[1] Thomas Richardson, perpetual curate of St. Benet Finck,[2] and John Wood, a chaplain who became rector of St. Dionis Backchurch in 1603,[3] showed no outward sign of religious nonconformity. But enough of the leading City radicals were also associated with the Essex household to suggest the Earl's own inclinations. He had long been a patron of William Hubbock, the minister in the Tower;[4] Henry Holland, editor of Greenham's writings, was believed to be a chaplain in 1599,[5] as was Anthony Wotton.[6] Stephen Egerton was protected by Essex in 1598 following complaints of parishioners "...leaving their own pastors and flocking after Mr. Egerton."[7]

Ministerial attachment to Essex was first demonstrated during his illness while in disgrace in late 1599. Rumours of special prayers, fasts, and the tolling of bells in parish churches in respect to him, as well as indiscretions uttered in

---

1. For his connection with Essex, cf. PRO. SP. 12/274/1
2. PRO. SP. 12/273/59.
3. He was described as a chaplain to Essex in 1597, GLMS 9234/6. f.250v.
4. Collinson, op.cit.1209.
5. GLMS. 9234/5, f.237r.[2nd.fol.section]. He dedicated his Treatise on Witchcraft (1590), to Essex (DNB).
6. DNB.
7. HMC Hatfield MSS.,xi,154.

sermons both at Paul's Cross and in parish pulpits brought a sharp royal reprimand on Bancroft and Stanhope.[1] The latter examined the rumours; some he denied, others he found elusive to trace "...for London Churches be so manie, and some ministers so variable, as Argus himselfe could not have an eye, in all these Churches at ons."[2] The only casualty, however, appears to have been Richardson who was for a time inhibited from preaching and restrained within a private house.[3] A year later, Egerton, Wotton, and Phillips, were incriminated in the Essex rebellion, at least in so far as they refused to condemn it according to prescribed orders;[4] Egerton suffered with his patron, and was suspended from his weekday exercise in the Blackfriars.[5]

The Essex episode indicates that a measure of Puritan activity, subdued as it was, survived the decade. With the accession of James, the fruits of their labour appeared at hand to Wotton, Egerton and the rest. Reinforced by the dynamic ener of Edmund Snape, the old Northampton preacher who succeeded Phillips as lecturer at St. Saviour's Southwark in 1605,[6] the radical cause revived. A petition to James against uniformity

---

1. PRO. SP. 12/273/55.
2. PRO. SP. 12/273/59.
3. IBid.
4. Collinson, op.cit. 1217.
5. HMC. Hatfield MSS. xi, 148.
6. LCCRO. VM. 1581-1628, [no fol.].

in religious observances attracted the signatures of twenty-two London ministers,[1] a number that would hardly have been credible in the nineties; between 1604-5, three incumbents were ejected for nonconformity,[2] and at least four unbeneficed preachers, including, inevitably Egerton, were suspended.[3] As the number of endowed lectureships increased, as impropriations fell into the hands of Puritan citizens, and as funds for the relief of unbeneficed ministers were established,[4] the foundations on which thrived clerical radicalism grew firmer, and the positions of its exponents subsequently became more entrenched.

---

1. BM. MS. Sloane 271, f.35r. (undated). No signatures are appended.
2. William Jackson, R. of St. Swithin (1605); Richard Smith, R. of St. Nicholas Acon (1604); William Chibbald, R. of St.Nicholas Cole Abbey (sequestered 1605). For Chibbald's deprivation, see LCCRO. Lib. VG. Stanhope, V.f.198r.
3. They were Egerton, Wotton, Horne (curate of St. Magnus), Evans (?). (Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries, ed. M.M.Knappen (Chicago,1933), 31.
4. e.g. the legacy of £500 p.a. made by Sarah Venables, widow of a merchant-taylor, in 1606 - to be distributed "...unto and amongst suche poore Ministers as are or shalbe putt from their places and Livings (which I see are grievouslye distressed)." (Somerset House, PCC. 56 Windebanck).

CHAPTER TWELVE

CONCLUSIONS.

Inter-dependent as they were, the dominant characteristics of the ecclesiastical structure in Elizabethan London can be separately classified. The first was peculiar neither to the clerical estate nor to a Protestant ministry. Many were the Elizabethan heirs of Chaucer's priest that

> "...ran unto London unto Poules
> To seken him a chaunterie for soules",[1]

though the lectureship had replaced the chantry as the principal attraction. The substantial income of many of the City livings, - despite well-justified clerical complaints of their failure to tap the secular wealth of the capital at the rate laid down in the Henrician tithe assessment -, accounted possibly as much as the opportunities for untaxed augmentation by means of subsidiary employment, for the gravitation of rural-born aspirants towards London for ordination and preferment. The vocational attraction of an over-populated, plague-ridden, community was doubtless fortified by the concentration of ecclesiastical patronage in the capital, in the Lord Keeper's household or the episcopal entourage, or, to the less scrupulous, along the Walk at St. Paul's;

---

1. Prologue, quoted in H.H.Milman, Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral (1868), 147.

"Go, take possession of the Church-Porch-door,
And ring thy bels: luck stroken in thy fist,
The Parsonage is thine . . . . . ",

was Joseph Hall's counsel.[1]

The hireling may have jostled with the 'faithful pastor' on the London road, but his progress generally came to a halt outside the parsonage gate. The patronage pattern, with its overall majority of ecclesiastical patrons, and a virtual monopoly of the most substantial livings by archbishop and bishop, allowed for an effective sieving of clerical potential, once the ministerial dearth of the early years of the reign had been overcome. The preaching quality of the London ministry became proverbial; its academic distinction, leavened by carefully-selected archiepiscopal and episcopal chaplains, made it the nursery of eighteen future bishops during the course of the reign, twelve of them being incumbents in the last decade of the century. The London of Lancelot Andrewes, Nicholas Felton, and Richard Bancroft, represented the high watermark of Elizabethan Anglicanism.

The quality of the ministry must undoubtedly account in part for the subdued nature of nonconformity among the beneficed clergy of the city, for Puritanism legitimately throve on abuses within the ecclesiastical establishment. Underlying

---

1. Virgidemianum (1597), quoted in W.S.Simpson, Chapters In The History of Old S. Paul's (1881), 250.

this was the pattern of patronage, and the ill-representation of sympathetic peers and gentry upon whose favours the Puritan movement prospered in Essex and East Anglia. Again, the number of impropriated perpetual curacies, possibly the key to the success of Puritanism in Suffolk, was fairly small in London. Radical feeling in the capital, it may be noted, survived most tenaciously in such enclaves as the Minories and the Blackfriars, precincts least vulnerable to ecclesiastical supervision. This latter aspect, negative as it was, was the most decisive reason for the virtual eclipse of clerical nonconformity by 1592. Parker's ruthless ultimatum in 1566 had split open the radical solidarity of the Marian exiles and their followers. Henceforward, London nonconformity swung leftwards to the fringes of the establishment, particularly the parish lectureship, and became dominated by extremists, many of them nurtured in the semi-separatism of the Minories. Potentially isolated from the main stream of parochial activity, the insecurity of the Puritan position was exposed by the measures against lecturers taken by Whitgift and Aylmer in the early 1580s. With little support from the beneficed ranks, - of the London classical group, only Gardiner was beneficed post-1583, and his living lay outside the City archdeaconry -, clerical radicalism survived precariously on Scottish crutches until its eclipse after the death of Field. Aylmer may not have been a "...Samuel, or rather a Solomon, with all graces and gifts of

learning, policy, wisdom and knowledge...", [1] but few were his peers in the art of disciplinary government.

Tendencies, growing apparent by the end of the century, however, were already indicating that the Puritan eclipse was temporary. The London citizenry had traditionally maintained a jealous and influential voice in ecclesiastical affairs by means of their customary right in most parishes to appoint both church-wardens. [2] The reorganisation of vestries, by cutting down numbers, and attaching conditions to membership, improved the efficiency of lay vehicles of expression. More directly significant was the increasing tendency to participate in, and, if possible, wrest the control of, the appointment of the minister. Lay experience in the selection and controlling of lecturers, and, in some places, assistant curates, doubtless accelerated this trend. Advantage of Crown financial difficulties in the early 1590s was taken by a few parishes to purchase the impropriation. Where the revenues were neither appropriated nor impropriated, the advowson could sometimes be bought, generally pro hac vice. Elsewhere, indirect pressure was often exerted, possibly with considerable effect.

---

1. These, according to Sandys, were the qualities needed to govern the diocese of London (The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, ed. J.Ayre, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1842), 330.).
2. Elsewhere, one was appointed by the incumbent. For the rights of parishioners, see A.Pulling, A Practical Treatise on the Law, Customs, and Regulations of the City and Port of London (1842), 262-3.

Aspirations towards congregational control were rarely sectarian in character at this time, as is clear from the frequent appointment of orthodox ministers by parochial proprietors. Citizen patrons certainly gave expression to Puritan values of ministerial standards as they sought for single-beneficed, resident, and preaching pastors. But beyond this, they seldom ventured. As Professor Wright pointed out, the sermons that were most popular in print were not those "... which open questions of dissension, but those which show the way to earthly harmony and eventual salvation."[1] It was left to a future generation to exploit and extend the rights of ministerial appointment, acquired by the late Elizabethan citizen, for sectarian purposes. The Jacobean feoffees who purchased impropriations for the maintenance of nonconformist ministers, were the spiritual heirs of the parochial proprietors of the later Elizabethan age.

---

1. L.B.Wright, Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England (1935), 279.

APPENDIX A.

HENNESSY[1]: ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

"His name is a guarantee of accuracy", said W.M.Noble of the Rev. George Hennessy;[2] "[I] cannot lay claim to absolute perfection", the latter modestly disclaimed.[3] Few, indeed, are his errors, but the accessibility of records, not availabl sixty years ago, has enabled many of the gaps in his lists to be filled. Most incomplete among the London parishes were thos in the collation of the dean and chapter of St.Paul's, whose registers for the Elizabethan period have not survived, and the perpetual curacies, disposed of by the patron without recourse to episcopal institution. The gaps are oftem still substantial, but many new names have been traced from the Call books drawn up at episcopal visitations, ordinatiom volumes, the books of the diocesan vicar-general with their record of licences to serve cures, the archidiaconal certificates of 1560 and 1561, miscellaneous parish records, and from wills proved in the commisserial and archidiaconal courts The additions are ennumerated below, with the source given alongside. The relevant page reference to Hennessy is givem after the name of the parish. The period concerned is 1560-1603; the confusiom of 1558-9 makes precise location oftem impossible for those years.

(1).Rectories and Vicarages. Source.

All Hallows Lombard Street. (p.78).

Roger Mathew not instituted.....Reg.Parker,iii,1071-2.

St.Alphage. (p.86).

J.Vernon: 1560(here).....Mullins,264.

James Smith: 1593-1603.....GLMS.1432/3,passim.

---

(1).G.Hennessy, Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londiniense. (1898).

(2).W.M.Noble, Incumbents of the County of Huntingdon,iii,54.

(3).Hennessy.vii.

St.Andrew Undershaft. (p.93).

Thomas Johnson: curate only..LCCRO.Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.140

St.Andrew Wardrobe. (p.88).

William Sage (1570-4).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)

St.Anne and Agnes. (p.95).

Edward Edgeworth (1578-80,res.)....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)

John King (1580-86,probably'87)....MS.9537/6,f.109r.

St.Antholin. (p.302).

'Colwyn'= 'Tolwyn'.....LCCRO.Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.51v.

William Atkinson died 1563....Register,Harleian Soc,viii (1883),15.

Thomas Tymme: resigned 1592....Alumni Cantab.I,iv,283.

Nicholas Felton: 1608(here)....GLMS.1046/1,f.95v.

St.Augustine. (p.98).

J.Riddlesdale: 1560(here).....Mullins,264.

St.Bartholomew Less. (p.102).

Thomas Taylor: departed by 1564.
Henry Atkinson (1564-5,died)
David Edwards (1566-7)
Thomas Foulkes (1568-9)
} St.Barts.Hosp.Rec.Office, Ledgers,Hb 1/1 (no fol.)

St.Benet Sherehog.(p.387-8)

Nicholas Nicholls, probably not rector but curate.....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Living vacant 1555-78....MS.9537/3-4;Mullins,258.

St.Botolph Billingsgate. (p.108).

Griffith Williams 1559-73....LCCRO.Lib.Act.1569-72,f.295r.

No record of John Mullens being rector.

John Fawcet 1588-92(here)[1].....Alumni Oxon.I,ii,487.

St.Clement Eastcheap. (p.129).

J.Robinson 1560(here)-71.....Mullins,260.

Francis Kitchen 1590-92(here)....GLMS.9537/8,f.88r.

St.Edmund Lombard Street. (p.142).

Th.Cote 1561(here).....Mullins,277.

---

(1).Probably here until 1595 when new incumbent collated.

St.Faith. (p.99).

Th.Mountain 1560-73 (died)....Alumni Cantab.I,iii,223.

St.George Botolph Lane. (p.109-10).

Owen Jones presented, but revoked....Lansd.MS.444,f.132r.

St.Giles Cripplegate. (p.172).

John Young, possibly here 1564.....DNB.

Robert Crowley 1565-6 (deprived).(1)

St.Gregory. (p.321).

William Farmer 1563(here).....GLMS.9051/3,f.30v.

No record of Thomas White here.

Ambrose Golding 1586(here)-1606.....SP.ii,181.

St.Helen's Bishopsgate. (p.210).

Richard Clapham 1577(here)-84(here)....GLMS.6836,f.278r;
...MS.9234/1,f.93v.(2nd fol.section)

Richard Lewis 1586(here)-90.....SP.ii,182.

John Oliver not here 1576; here 1590-1600.....
...GLMS.6836,ff.50r,53v.

No record of Nicholas Felton here at all.

Holy Trinity Less. (p.250).

Vacant 1560.....Mullins,265.

Robert Chakley 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)

John Steward 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

St.James Garlickhithe. (p.248).

John Lownd = J.Lunn (died 1578)..LCCRO.Lib.VG.Hamond,f.120v

Th.Crowe instituted 1578.....GLMS.9531/13,f.114r.

---

(1).Correspondence of Matthew Parker 1535-1575,ed. J.Bruce, Parker Soc.(Cambridge 1853),276.

(2).An inaccurate list is given by J.E.Cox, The Annals of St.Helen's, Bishopsgate (1876),54. He antedates Oliver's tenure from 1590 to 1575, and describes Barber and Gardiner as curates rather than lecturers.

St. John Walbrook.(p.304).
Vacant 1560,1561.....Mullins, 257,275.
Richard Mathew not here 1587.
Chris. Tappam 1586-1610(here).....GLMS.9537/9 (no fol.);
...GLMS.577/1,f.27v.

St. John Evangelist.(p.309-10).
Peter Greenwood 1564-74(here) .....
....Subsidy list,Lambeth CM.1/74.

St. John Zachary.(p.96).
William Toft 1560-80(here).....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.).

St. Lawrence Jewry.(p.267).
Th. Sanderson: 1594-1614 (d).....
.....Register,Harleian Soc.LXX (1940),129.

St. Leonard Foster Lane.(p.127).
Robert Crome: 1561(here).....Mullins,270.

St. Margaret Lothbury.(p.279).
Geoffrey Downes: presented 1569.....Lansd.MS.443,f.161r.

St. Margaret New Fish St.(p.276).
Humphrey Perkins: restored by 1560.....Mullins,268.

St. Martin Orgar.(p.130).
Thomas (not Henry) Withers 1560(here)-69..GLMS.959/1,f.22r.

St. Mary Bothaw.(p.390).
Henry Bradshaw instituted 1566.....Reg. Parker,ii,462.

St. Mary Mountkaw.(p.348).
J.Clarke instituted 1594 (Aug.27).....GLMS.9531/13
...(loose folios)

St. Mary Staining.(p.338).
Th.Franklin resigned 1560.....Mullins,263.
Vacant 1561.....Ibid.283
J.Lawnd presented 1584, instituted 1586.....
...GLMS.9531/13,f.227r.

St. Mary Woolnoth.(p.315).
Miles Garrard 1561(here).....Mullins,277
Th.Buckmaster instituted 1571 .....GLMS.9531/13,f.163r.

St.Mary Magdalene Milk Street. (p.268).
Alex.Smyth (Smelling): 1560(here).....Mullins,263.
Th.Walbutt: 1561-6 (resigned).....GLMS.2596/1,f.135v.
J.Bullingham: 1566-71 (resigned)....Ibid.ff.135v,149r.
Th.Edmunds resigned,not died, 1575..Ibid.f.156r.
St.Mary Magdalene Old Fish Street. (p.319).
Th.Chipping: 1560(here).....Mullins,267.
J.Askew: 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Wm.Clarke: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
St.Matthew Friday Street. (p.435).
J.Presse: 1573-1612 (died)....Alumni Cantab.I,iii,392.
Rob.Sherington not in possession.(1)
St.Michael Bassishaw. (p.331).
Roger Barker: 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Roger Greene: 1586(here).....MS.9537/6,f.111r.
Wm.Hutchinson: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)
St.Michael LE Querne. (p.436).
- Mason: 1560(here).....Mullins,268.
Th.Pemberton: 1567(here).....GLMS.9051/3,f.198v.
J.Gravett: 1577(here).....LCCRO.Lib.Act.1577-9,f.61v.
St.Michael Queenhithe. (p.249).
'Readall'= Bedell.
St.Nicholas Acon. (p.144).
Vacant 1560-1,probably until 1571....Mullins,258,277.
Chris.Stile: presented 1571.....Lansd.MS.443,f.202v.
Roger Sims (Symons) 1592-98(here)..GLMS.9537/9 (no fol.)
Richard Griffith presented but not instituted...Lansd.MS. 445,f.17r.

---

(1).Hennessy noted that he had compounded for part of his first fruits, and assumed that he was in possession. In fact,by the statute of Henry VIII (26 H.VIII.c.3), composition was required before any actual or real possession (Burn,ii,276). The same error is made with Thomas Dunscomb at St.Thomas Apostle.

St.Nicholas Cole Abbey. (p.345).
Th.Petty: 1580(here).....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)
George Hallam: instituted 1580 (Dec.10)..MS.9531/13,f.200r.
St.Nicholas Olave. (p.351).
J.Seward: 1583(here).....GLMS.9537/5 (no fol.)
St.Olave Silver Street. (p.73).
J.Koll (Hill): 1560(here)-1563 (died)....Mullins,263.
...GLMS.9051/3,f.21v.
Rowland Herring: 1580(here).....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)
J.Flint: 1592-1610.....Alumni Cantab.I,ii,151.
St.Peter Cornhill. (p.375).
J.Gough deprived 1566.....LCORO.Rep.16,f.74r.
St.Peter in the Tower. (p.373).
Roger Massey: 1580(here).....GLMS.9051/4,f.196r.
St.Peter le Poer. (376).
Robert CrowleyL 1561(here)-1566 (deprived)(1)..Mullins,282.
Th.Wright: 1567(here).....GLMS.4093/1 (no fol.)(Aug 14)
James Young: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Edward Leyfield: 1575-83 (died)..MS.9537/4-5 passim.
St.Peter Paul's Wharf. (p.351).
Owen Jones presented, not instituted...Lansd.MS.444,f.119r.
J.Hinde (Keene): 1598(here).....GLMS.9537/9 (no fol.)
St.Sepulchre. (p.383).
Richard Vaughan } presented not instituted.
Th.Singleton } ....Lansd,MS.445,ff.34r,139r.
St.Stephen Coleman Street. (p.385).
Apparently vacant 1562-94.
Rich.Thomas: curate 1569-78(here)....MS.9171/15,f.347v;
9171/16,f.131r.,f.417r.
J.Lodge curate only.
Hugh Smith curate only, 1580-c.2....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

---

(1).No actual record of deprivation exists, and it is possible that he resigned the living to avoid that indignity.

St.Stephen Coleman Street.(continued).
Wm.Wells presented but not instituted;
curate 1582-93.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.296r.
Wm.Taylor curate 1589,
instituted vicar 1594..MS.4457/2,ff.8r-38v,passim.
St.Stephen Walbrook. (p.385).
Th.Beacon: 1560(here).....Mullins,255.
St.Thomas Apostle. (p.301).
Ralph Bentley: 1560(here)-83.....Mullins,266.
J.Duffield: 1586-90.....GLMS.9537/6,f.113v;SP.ii,183.
Th.Dunscomb curate only[1]....MS.9537/6,f.113v.
St.Vedast. (p.433).
Martin Clipsam: 1559(here)-71....GLMS.9171/15,f.6r.
Wm.Morsett probably not instituted.

(II).Perpetual Curacies.[2]	Source.
All Hallows Staining. (p.85)[3]	
Humphrey Fletcher: 1560-1(here)....	Mullins,277; MS.4956/2 f.13r.
Giles Sinclair (Seyntcler): 1563-6; 1570-1(here).....	LCCRO.Lib.VG.Huick,f.116v. GLMS.4958/1,f.162r;MS.9171/15,f.167r.
Wm.Hall: 1567-70; 1572-80(here)..	GLMS.9537/4[illegible]; MS.4958/1,f.139r.
~ Jennings: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)	

(1).Cf. supra, p.597,note 1.
(2).These lists are not complete, but supplement those of Hennessy. Some of the ministers named may have been assistants to the perpetual curate; this would explain the occasional overlap (e.g.Tirrent at the Blackfriars).
(3).A.Povah, The Annals of ...All Hallows Staining, (1894), added a few names to Hennessy's list (p.354).

All Hallows Staining (continued)

Michael Hill: 1585-6(here)....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.48r.
....MS.9537/6,f.115v.
Richard Lightfoot: 1587.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.166v.
Wm.Scott:1589 (here).....MS.9537/7,f.110 v.
J.Oliver: 1590.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.19r.
Gervase Walker: 1591-2(here)..GLMS.9535/2,f.53r.
...MS.9537/8,f.83r.
J.Simpson: 1594.....MS.9535/2,f.64r.
Melchisedeck Francis: 1595-1607...PRO.E.179/ 44/304.

All Hallows Less.(p.85).

Chris.Digges (Dykes): 1560(here).....Mullins,262.
Philip Handmer: 1561(here).....Ibid.275
Thomas Watson: 1562-4 (died)...GLMS.9051/3,f.46r;
....Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.58v.
Th.Benbow: 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Th.Harrold: 1577(here)-1583(here)...MS.9537/4-5 (no fol.)
J.Haulton (Hawton): 1586(here)....SP.ii,180;MS.9537/6,f.116
Rob.Burton: 1590.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.4r.
J.Tomson: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.83r.
Mark Sadlington: resigned 1597.....GLMS.9051/5,f.58r.
Th.Tanner: 1597.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.133v.
Peter Sefton: 1598.....Ibid.iv,f.162v.

St. Anne Blackfriars.(p.88).[1]

Wm.Wager: 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Th.Spering: 1577-8(here).....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.124v.
Chris.Watson: 1578-c.82 (died)[2]. Ibid. f 136r

---

(1) Contrary to what is usually written (eg.DNB), it is very unlikely that the Puritan preacher, Stephen Egerton, was ever perpetual curate here; he was certainly not so before 1612. Throughout, he was the preacher or lecturer; another served the cure. (Cf.visitation call books).

(2) Henry Knolles, by his will dated July,1582 (*), left 40/- annuity to the son of Christopher Watson,"...our late minister and pastor of worthy memory in Blackfriars" (PCC.43 Rowe). I owe this reference to the kindness of Mrs.P.Hyde. The DNB. dated Watson's death as before June,1581.

Rich.Bond: 1580.....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Francis Scarlet: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
David Dee: 1586(here).....MS.9537/6,f.108v.
George Smith: 1589.....GLMS.9535/2,f.41r.
Th.Pratt: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.103v.
Mathew Saunders: 1590.....MS.9535/2,f.50r.
David English: 1592-1604.....MS.9535/2,f.61r.
Andrew Tirrint: 1595.....MS.9535/2,f.69v.

St. Benet Finck.(p.377).

Rich.Beard: 1560(here).....GLMS.4097,f.36r.
J.Bakehouse: 1560(here).....Mullins,262.
Rich.Wilmot: 1561(here).....Ibid.282.
Th.Richardson: 1585-1606.....MS.4097,passim.

St. Botolph Aldersgate.(p.105).

Rich.Bosom:1560(here).....Mullins,261.
Wm.Scotson: 1561-73 (died).....Ibid.270.
Th.Leigh: 1574-c.79.....GLMS.1454,Nos.77-81.
Wm.Wilkinson: 1580-2.....Ibid.Nos.82-4;MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

No record of J.Caldwell here.

J.Morrison: 1582-92 (died).....GLMS.1454,Nos.85-94.
Wm.Cox: 1593 (died).....Ibid.Nos.94-5.
Rich.Griffith: 1593-8.....Ibid.Nos.95-8.

St. Botolph Aldgate (p.106).[1]

Wm.Lockear: 1560(here).....Mullins,264.
Rich.Bosom: 1561(here).....Ibid.279.
James Rylands: 1563(here).....GLMS.9051/3,f.35r.
Robert Heaz: 1564-94 (died)....GLMS.9235/1, (no fol.)

Holy Trinity Minories.(p.429).

A detailed list of Elizabethan ministers (incumbents, curates,and preachers),has been printed by E.M.Tomlinson,[2] and need not be repeated. A few amendments are possible:-

---

(1) A.G.B.Atkinson, St.Botolph Aldgate (1898),corrected Hennessy on the date of Heaz's admission.(p.79).
(2) E.M.Tomlinson, A History of the Minories London (1907) 220-1.

"Croubey"- Crowley (Robert)
Bowman and Bonham are doubtless the same person.
"Cently" is probably Giles Sinclair (Seyntcler).
Hearse (Heaz) and Hayes are the same person.

St.James Clerkenwell. (p.247).

- Darvye: 1560(here).....Mullins,263.
Roger Wright: 1561(here).....Ibid,272.
Hugh Lewis: 1572(here),1577(here)..GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Evan Roberts: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Augustine Charke: 1578?.....GLMS.9535/2,f.1r.
- Crowe: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Th.Price: 1585 (died)..Register,Harleian Soc.xvii (1891),32

St.Katherine Cree. (p.118).

Richard Allen: 1560(here).....Mullins,259.
Richard Henry: 1561-3(here)....Ibid.277;GLMS.9171/15,f.143r.
J.Craile: 1563-77 (died).....GLMS.9171/16,f.244v; LCCRO. Bullock,f.235v.
J.Argall: 1577(here).....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)
David Dee: 1579(here).....LCCRO.Lib.Act.1579-81,f.102r.
Wm.Stock: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Chris.Cowse: 1583(here)-95...MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
David English: 1596-1603.....MS.9171/18,f.302r.

St.Lawrence Pountney.(1)

Wm.Woodley: 1560-1 (died)....LCCRO.Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.47r.
Rob.Sheriff: 1561(here).....Mullins,280.
J.Baron: 1563-69(here)...Wilson,op.cit.129;MS.9051/3,f.221v.
Rob.Hailes: 1571(here)-1580...GLMS.3907/1 (no fol.)
J.Haulton: 1580-92.....Ibid;GLMS.9537/6,f.123v.
Th.Mann: 1592-c.96.....GLMS.9537/8,f.88r.
Rich.Lightfoot: 1596-1600(here)..MS.3907/1 (no fol.)
Michael Crode: 1601-3.....Ibid.

---

(1).No Elizabethan names in Hennessy. A fairly complete list has been printed by H.B.Wilson, A History of St.Laurence Pountney (1831),102. The reference to Wm.Woodley as minister in 1591 is obviously wrong.

St. Mary Aldermanbury.(p.298-9).[1]

J.Becter: 1560(here)-63(here).....Mullins,260; Register,Harleian Soc.61 (1931),22.

J.Browne: 1565-6 (ejected)....Register,26-8.

Chris.Baytman: 1567-9.....Ibid. 31.

Wm.Graves: 1569.....GLMS.3570/1,f.1v.

J.Presse: 1571-3....GLMS.3556/1,p.22;MS.9171/16,f.65v.

Rob.Cart: 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Joshua Gilpin: 1575.....GLMS.3556/1,p.77.

Robert Blithman: 1576-7.....GLMS.3570/1,f.5r.

Chris.Blithman: 1577-88(d).....Ibid.f.6r.

Michael Salford: 1588-91.....Ibid.f.22r.

Robert Harland: 1591-1617.....Ibid.f.30r.

St. Mary Colechurch.(p.284).

Rich.Langhorne: 1560-63(here)[2]....Mullins,256;GLMS.9051/3, f.43r.

Rob.Hutton: 1571-3(here).....PRO.E.179,43/287-8.

J.Bennet: 1577(here).....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Rich.Turnbull: c.1580-93.....Ibid.

---

(1) An incomplete list is printed by P.C.Carter, the History... of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury.(1913),38. He names Wm.Trevor as minister in 1574, but no confirmation can be found. His reference to Salford is inaccurate both in date and in name.

(2) He kept his vicarage at Edmonton until his death in 1571; possibly, he was also at Colechurch until then.

APPENDIX B.

CURATES.

These lists are intended to cover curates serving vacant benefices as well as those deputising for absentee parsons or assisting resident incumbents. Ministers in perpetual curacies are named in Appendix A, and need not be repeated. The 1560 Certificates mark the commencing date for these lists.

A few of the names have been noted by Hennessy, but the great majority are collected for the first time. Visitation Call books, vicar-general records, parish registers, minutes, and accounts, and wills constitute the principal sources. The transient passage of so many ministers through the London parishes makes a complete list impossible; moreover the gaps are many in the thirteen churches that made up the peculiar jurisdiction of the deanery of Arches, as their parishioners' wills were not proved in the archidiaconal or commissarial court.

Graduates among these curates are indicated by the symbol x. Unless otherwise specified, the dates are those of first appointment, or, where this cannot be found, of official sanction.

Source.

All Hallows Barking.

Wm. Jones: 1561(here)..... Mullins, 272.
Rich. Harman: 1563(here).....GLMS,9171/15,f.133r.
Henry Davidson: 1572(here).....MS.9171/16,f.99r.
Wm.Leyland: 1574(here).....GLMS.9537/3 (no fol.)
J. Taylor: 1574-1607.....LCCRO.Lib.Examin.1597-1600 (no fol. sub April 16, 1600.
Wm. Francis: 1587(here).....MS.9171/17,f.151r.

All Hallows Honey Lane.

x Th. Wilcox: 1570(here)-71(here)...MS.9171/16,f.37v; Register,Harleian Soc.XLIV (1914),104.
J. Hall: 1580(here).....GLMS.9537/4 (no fol.)

All Hallows Lombard Street.

- Herman: 1586(here).....SP. ii,180.

All Hallows London Wall.

Th. Reniger: 1560-61.....Mullins,262, 278.

Wm. Dawson: 1567(here).....GLMS.5090/2 (no fol.)

All Hallows Great.

Wm. Penn: 1560(here).....Mullins,260.

Lewis Wager: 1561(here).....Ibid.280.

Th. Sudlow: 1563(here).....MS.9051/3,f.196v.

J. ThrelMeld: 1571(here).....PRO.E.179,43/287.

Rich. Lewis: 1585(here)....LCCRO.Lib.Corr.1583-6,xvi,f.16r.

- Baugh: 1597 (removed).....GLMS.819/1,f.15r.

x Th.Pullen: 1597 .....Ibid. f.15r.

J.Briggs: 1598-9(here).....MS.9051/5, f.136r.

St.Alban Wood Street.

J.Smyth: 1561(here).....Mullins,275.

J.Owgan: 1567(here).....MS.9171/15,f.280r.

J.AskewL1567-71(here).....PRO.E.179,43/287.

x J.Bateman: 1574-6(here).....MS.9171/16,f.153r.

- Bagnold: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Th.Davies: 1580(here).....Ibid.

Francis Kitchen: 1583(here)....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

J.Payne: 1585-7.....MS.9535/2,f.29r;MS.7673/1,f.5

St.Alphage.

Robert Sheriff: 1560(here).....Mullins,265.

Richard Holmes: 1574-85.....GLMS.1432/2-3,passim.

x Th. Johnson: 1585-6(here),....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.48r.

George Ashbourne: 1587-96.....MS.1432/3,passim.

St.Andrew Holborn.

Geo. Mayborne: 1574(here)....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Wm. Jennings: 1577-8(here)...MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

~~Wm. Jennings: 1577-8(here).~~

St.Andrew Holborn (continued.)

Dominic Jackson: 1580-? .....MS.9051/4,f.216v.
Benjamin Samuel: 1592-6(here)....GLMS.9537/8,f.77r.
[x]Henry Child: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9,f.159r.
Henry Bradford: 1602(here).....PRO.E.179,44/317.

St.Andrew Hubbard.

Th. Warter: 1558(here)-61.....GLMS.1279/2,f.83r.
Wm.Thorne: 1561-8.....Ibid.ff.97r-113v.; Mullins,278.
J.Buffin: 1573-4(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Andrew Peake: 1586.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.86r.
- Wall: 1586.....SP.ii,180.
Peter Sefton: 1587.....MS.1279/2,f.136r.
[x]Wm. Scott: 1588-9.....MS.1279/2,f.136r.
[x]Henry Howe: 1588-90.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.250r.
[x]Peter Rich: 1589-92:.....MS.9535/2,f.48v.
[x]Gabriel Bowman: 1590.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.347v.
James Stile: 1592-3(here)....MS.1279/2,f.147r.
[x]Nicholas Alsop: 1593-5:.....Ibidf.154r.
[x]Edmund Cartwright: 1596.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.97r.
J.Tomson: 1596-7.....Ibid.f.120v.
[x]Th. Crosse: 1597-8...Ibid.iv,f.12v;MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Andrew Undershaft.

J.Johnson: 1560-65.....LCCRO.Lib.Com.1583-6,xiv,f.12v.
[x]Rich. Wall: 1593.....MS.9535/2,f.64r.
Wm. Stepney: 1594-6(here)....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.82r.
- Webb: 1597(here).....Ibid.iv,f.11r.
Chris.Hailes: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9,f.181r.

St.Andrew Wardrobe.

Rob. Sheriff: 1560-1(here).....Mullins,264, 279.
Wm. Martin: 1564(here).....MS.9051/3,f.166r.
J.Taylor: 1568(here).....Ibid.f.218r.
Nicholas Abbs: 1573(here).....MS.9051/4,f.32r.
Wm. Clark: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

St.Andrew Wardrobe (continued).

x Basildus Beseley: 1576(here).....MS.9051/4,f.89r.
Th. Bendlow: 1577(here).....MS.2088/1,f.27r.
J.Thirkell: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
x J.Griffin: 1582.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.306r.
Rich. Griffin: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol).
- Saunders: 1586(here).....SP.ii,180.
Lewis Phillips: 1588.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.217v.
Rich. Lloyd: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.103v.
- Nicholson: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.77r.
Wm.Stepney:1596-8(here).....MS.9537/9,f.157v;
Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.70v.
x Th.Crosse: 1601(here).....MS.2088/1 (no fol.)

St.Anne and Agnes.

Wm. Smith: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Th. Bayley: 1586.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.81v.

St.Antholin.

x Chris. Rosedale: 1577-82.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.92v.;
..PRO.E.179,43/298.
x David Dee: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Francis Barton: 1583-6(here)..MS.9537/5-6,f.108v.
Rich.Benbow: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.103v.
x Rob.Gibson: 1595-7 (died).....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,ff.42v,97v

St.Augustine.

James Renegar: 1560-74 (died)...LCCRO.Cons.Ct.Bullock.f.184v

St.Bartholomew Exchange.

x Samuel Ke[illegible]tridge: 1591(here)...VM.ed.E.Freshfield (1890),25.
x Philip Walker: 1592.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.67v.
x J.Eaton: 1594-6(here).....VM. 29-36,passim.
x J.Arg[illegible]ll: 1597.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iv,f.4v.
- Crooke: 1602(here).....VM.45.
x Gabriel Rosse: 1602.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iv,f.74r.

St.Bartholomew Great.
Rich.Jennings: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Ed.Tegyn: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

St.Benet Gracechurch.
Rob.Tallage: 1561(here).....Mullins,280.
J.Davidson: 1566(here).....MS.9171/15,f.261v.
J.Bennet: 1577(here).....MS.1568,p.263.
Th.Ryder: 1578(here).....Ibid.p.271.
Wm.Wordall: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
x Rich.Curtis: 1584(here).....*Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.4v.*
George Ashbourne: *1585-7.....Ibid.f.48r.*
x J.Eborne: 1587-8.....*MS.9535/2,f.41v.*
Chris.Hailes: 1589(here).....*MS.9537/7,f.117v.*

St.Benet Sherehog.
Philip Hannd: 1561(here).....Mullins,279.
Nicholas Nicholls: 1565(here)-76.....Lib.VG.Huick,f.121v.
Wm.Knight: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
x Th.Banks: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
- Prat: 1586(here).....SP.ii,181.
x Michael Salford: 1586.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.79r.
x Edward Beck: 1587.....Ibid.f.150r.
Patrick Freebarne:1589.....MS.9535/2,f.48r.
x Henry Corenbeck: 1591.....MS.9535/2,f.53r.

St.Botolph Billingsgate.
Constantine Herman: 1574(here)....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
x Rich.Proctor: 1577-86(here).....MS.9537/4-5; SP.ii,181.
x Wm.More: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.83r.

St.Botolph Bishopsgate.
Edmund Boston: 1567(here).....MS.9171/15,f.288v.
J.Buffin: 1568-70(here).....Ibid.f.314v.
Nicholas Popham: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Th.Simpson: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
x Ed.Beck: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.117v.

St.Botolph Bishopsgate (continued).

x Th.Whitehand: 1591.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.18r.
J.Williams: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.87v.
Gregory Kirby: 1593.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.143v.
x Wm.Johnson: 1595.....Ibid.iii,f.2r.
x David Jones: 1595.....Ibid.f.~~18v~~.
Paul Bush: 1596.....Ibid.f.~~53r~~.

St.Bride.

J.Taylor: 1561-74....LCCRO.Lib.Examin.1597-1600 (no fol.) sub April 16,1600.
Anthony Fryer: 1561(here)-3(here).....Mullins,270; Bullock,f.66v.
x Maurice Edwards: 1597-8(here)...Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.146r.
x Rob.Rascoll: 1602.....Ibid v,f.82v.

Christ Church.

- Daniel: 1560-1(here).....Mullins,269.
Th.Cost (Costelat):1563(here)-5 (died)...Register,Harleian Soc.xxi (1895),265.
Wm.Beckwith: 1564-80.....St.Barts.H.b.1/1,passim.
J.Norris: 1581-6.....Ibid. (no fol.)
x Rich.Salt: 1586-90.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.111r.
Th.Lydes: 1590-1607.....Ibid.ii,f.15r; Hb.1/1 (no fol.)

St.Christopher le Stocks.

Wm.Hall: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
x Rob.Fish: 1578-80(here).....Ibid.
Chris.Dix: 1582-6 (died)[1]
x Basildus Begeley: 1586(here).....SP.ii,181.

---

(1) The Register Book of...St.Christopher le Stocks, ed. E.Freshfield (1882), 34.

St.Christopher le Stocks (continued).

Ed.Grosse: 1586(here)[1].....Accounts.17.

Rob.Perpoint: 1587.....MS.9535/2,f.38v.

xJ.Eaton: 1591.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.57v.

Henry Crowder: 1596.....Accounts,32.

St.Clement Eastcheap.

Chris.Hailes: 1585-6(here)....SP.ii,181;VG.Stanhope,i,36v.

Wm.Morrell: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.111v.

xEd.Clements: 1590.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.319r.

xWm.Janeway: 1596-8(here)..Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.97v.

St.Dionis Backchurch.

Wm.Welton: 1577 (died)[2]....Register,Harleian Soc.iii (1878 195.

Wm.Rogerson: 1585 (died).....Ibid.199.

Th.Steen: 1584-7(here).....MS.9171/17,f.130r;Lambeth Reg. Whitgift,i,f.109r.

St.Dunstan in the East.

Th.Cattell: 1572(here)-81 (died)...Register,Harleian Soc. LXIX.(1939),148.

Rich.Bond: 1583-5(here).....GLMS.4887,p.235.

Adam Colcloth: 1586-8 (died).....Ibid,p.243.

xTh.Whitnoll: 1588.....MS.4887,p.256.

xJ.Fawcett:1591-2.....Ibid.p.269.

xGeorge Goldman: 1600.....MS.4887,p.304.

St.Dunstan in the West.

J.Markant: 1559-61(here).....Mullins,270;MS.9171/15,f.8r.

Dominic Jackson: 1563(here)-79...MS.9171/15,f.151r.

Chris.Cowse: 1579[3].....GLMS.2968/1,f.319v.

---

(1).Accompts of the Churchwardens, ed.E.Freshfield (1885).

(2).He may have been the old Marian exile (or his son) of that name (Christine Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge 1938), 320.

(3).Possibly, he was merely a conductor.

St.Dunstan in the West (continued).

J.Haulton: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Richard Young: c.1581-1615 (died)...Cons.Ct.Regr.Hamer,f.20

St.Edmund Lombard Street.

Rob.Bainbrigg: 1563(here).....MS.9171/15,f.134v.

xRob.Dixon: 1585.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.65v.

Ed.Grosse: 1589.....Ibid,f.285v.

xJ.Richards: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.84r.

xEd.Spendlove: 1595-1612(here)...Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.18v.; MS.9537/11,f.88r.

St.Ethelburgha.

Hugh Treton: 1560-3(here)....Mullins,261,276;MS.9051/3,f.40v

Nicholas Popham: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

xLawrence Starkie: 1602.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,v,f.65r.

St.Giles Cripplegate.

Walter Tempest: 1563(here)....Egerton MS.2350,f.67r.

Th.Knell: 1569(here).....Somerset House,St.Paul's wills, (Book A, Th.Spenser.)

xJ.Field: 1570(here)(1)

Philip White: 1571-5(here)....PRO.E.179,43/287;GLMS.6318/1, f.34r.

George Conway: 1579-87(here).....SP.ii,182.

xJ.Jackson: 1595(here).....Addit.MS.12,922,f.95r.

xHumphrey Bancroft: 1598-1610 (died)....GLMS.6318/1,passim.

Holy Trinity Less.

J.Champneys: 1560(here).....Mullins,265.

Rob.Hutton: 1561-3(here).....MS.9051/3,f.10v.

J.Seward: 1572-7.....MS.9051/4,f.18v.

xGeorge Houlte: 1603.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,v,f.99r.

---

(1).Field's association with Cripplegate is clear from the appeals made by him in the Minories on behalf of poor parishioners, and from the entry in the Cripplegate register recording the birth of a daughter to Mr.Field, minister in May 1570.(E.M.Tomlinson, A History of the Minories (1907), 375; GLMS.6318/1,f.26r.)

St.James Garlickhithe.

Th.Knell: 1568.....GLMS.4810/1,f.34r.
Wm.Wager: 1569(here).....Ibid.f.34r.
James Stile: 1569-71.....MS.9171/16,f.6v.
Walter Kelly: 1573(here)-80(died)....GLMS.4810/1,f.45r.
x Edward Beck: 1587.....MS.9535/2,f.41v.

St.John Baptist Walbrook.

Wm.Grey: 1560-1(here).....Mullins,257,276.
Rich.Waddesbury: 1566(here) . . . MS 9051/3, f 190r.
Th.Dawe: 1570(here).....MS.9051/3,f.263r.
Philip Barton: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
Wm.Laske: 1583.....MS.9535/2,f.22v.
- Venam: 1586(here).....SP.ii,182.

St.Katherine Coleman.

Wm.Morrell: 1588.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.215v.
x Rob.Burton: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.84v.
x Melchisadeck Francis: 1594.....MS.9535/2,f.64r.
x Joachim Ball: 1595.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.18v.

St.Lawrence Jewry.

Th.Silvester: 1561(here)-70(died).....Mullins,275; Lib.VG.Huick,f.251r.
Wm.Hall: 1571(here).....MS.9171/16,f.62v.
Th.Franklin: 1578(died)....Register,Harleian Soc.LXX (1940), 121.
Francis Kitchen: 1583.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.325v.
J.Payne: 1584-9;1591-4....LCCRO.Lib.Examin.1591-4 (April 23, 1594)
J.Bevans: 1597(here)-1600(died).....Register,130.

St.Leonard Shoreditch.

J.Becket: 1570(here).....MS.9051/3,f.246v.
Rich.Pattinson: 1574(died)...Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.197v.
J.Staver: 1578 (removed)....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.102r.
x David Dee: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

St.Leonard Shoreditch (continued)

Rich.Gibbons: 1582-90.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.349r.;Lib.Examin. 1586-91 (Dec.1590).

[x]Henry Hasyll: 1598.....MS.9535/2,f.81v.

St.Magnus.

Wm.Bond: 1561-3(here)....Mullins,279;MS.9051/3,f.31r.

- Swan: 1561(here).....Mullins,280.

Th.Cooke: 1571(here)-80(here)[1]...MS.9051/4,ff.12r,173r.

[x]George Closse: c.1583-6...MS.9537/5 (no fol.);SP.ii,182.

[x]J.Simpson: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.113v.

[x]J.Tavenor: 1591-5(here)...MS.9535/2,f.54v;PRO.E.179,44/304.

[x]Samuel Horne: 1597-1604(suspended)....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii, f.133v;Two Puritan Diaries,ed.M.M.Knappen(1933) 31.

St.Margaret New Fish Street.

Rich.Atkinson: 1560(here).....Mullins,268.

Wm.Tempest: 1561(here).....Ibid,280

J.Lisby: 1570-74(here).....MS.9171/15,f.363r.

- Griffin: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol).

Walter Grey: 1583(here)....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.2r.

Sampson Masheder: 1582-4.....GLMS.1175/1 (no fol.)

[x]Wm.Regrim: 1585-6(here).....GLMS.1176/1 (no fol.)

[x]Wm.Harris: 1588.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.200r.

Wm.Beane: 1588.....MS.9535/2,f.40v.

[x]Philip Manfield: 1589-90(here)....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.337r.

James Speight: 1591.....MS.9535/2,f.53r.

Ed.Votyer: 1591-2(here).....Ibid.f.57r.

[x]Henry Halstead: 1592-5.....MS.9537/8,f.85r;MS.1176/1 (no fol.

---

(1).Thomas Norton, writing from the Tower in 1581? complained that there was not so much "...as a curate resident" at St. Magnus, but a minister from elsewhere "...hyred to saye ther services".(Addit.MS.4802,f.53v.). The date of Cooke's departure is not known.

St.Margaret New Fish Street.(continued)

x Wm.Tye: 1595.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f;11r.

x Humphrey Hill: 1596.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.56v.

x Paul Wilkinson: 1595-1602.....MS.1176/1 (no fol.)

St.Margaret Lothbury.

x John Vivian: 1575.....GLMS.4352/1,f.27r.

George Conway: 1577.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.69r.

Th.Rider: 1580.....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

x Rich.Reynolds: 1586.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.112r.

x Walter Jones: 1598.....Ibid.iv,f.78r.

St.Margaret Moses.

J.Denton: 1571-7(here).....MS.9051/4,f.8v.

Martin Clipsam: 1583.....Lib.Corr.1583-6,xvi,f.12v.

Rich.Roos: 1584.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.4r.

Th.Bayley: 1586(here).....SP.ii,182.

Rob.Perpoint: 1589(departed)...MS.9537/7,f.119v.

St.Margaret Pattens.

Th.Dawes: 1563-5(resigned).....GLMS.9171/15,f.184v.

Nicholas Standen: 1565.....GLMS.4570/2,p.46.

Rob.Perpoint: 1590.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.325v.

St.Martin Iremonger.

Th.Chamber: 1561(here).....Mullins,271.

George Hamond: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

x Wm.Armitage: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

x Henry Crowder: 1588-92.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.250v.

x Henry Amy: 1586.....Ibid,f.133v.

Th.Belby: 1595-8(here).....Ibid,iii,f.15r.

Humphrey Evans: 1601.....Ibid.v,f.40v.

St.Martin Ludgate.

Wm.Margetts: 1561-2(here)....Mullins,269;MS.9051/3,f.12r.

J.White: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

x Humphrey Cole: 1579-81(here)....MS.9051/4,f.174r.

St.Martin Ludgate.

Lionel Foster: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

[x]Michael Salford: 1585-7.....Lib.Examin.1586-91 (Feb.23 1890)

[x]Wm.Lightfoot: 1584-6(here).....MS.9535/2,f.25r.

Th.Bayley: 1591(here).....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.52r.

Rich.Baker: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.80v.

Henry Crowder: 1598-1612(here)..PRO.E.179,44/312; GLMS.9537/11,f.84v.

St.Martin Orgar.

Th.Price: 1595.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.14r.

St.Martin Outwich.

Albert Germanms: 1561(here).....Mullins,283.

Rich.Wilmot: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Th.Brightwell: 1577(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Wm.Tillotson: 1580.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.217v.

[x]Timothy Cotton: 1581.....Ibid.f.251v.

Edmund Sanderson: 1583-6(inhibited)...MS.9537/6,f.125r.

[x]Ed.Kyffin: 1585.....MS.9535/2,f.28v.

- Bull: 1586(here).....SP.ii,182

[x]Wm.Farmer: 1588-92(here).....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.243v.

[x]Th.Wood: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Martin Vintry.

Simon Moore: 1561(here).....Mullins,273.

Wm.Martin: 1574(died).....Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.184r.

Th.Robin: 1575(here).....MS.9171/16,f.226r.

Rob.Hill: 1578(here).....Ibid.f.388r.

Mile Ffrye: 1585.....MS.9535/2,f.31r.

St.Mary Abchurch.

Edmund Austin: 1560(here).....Mullins,258.

Rob.Hutton: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

[x]Jonas Jerdfield: 1579-80(here).....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.168r.

[x]Ralph Kendall: 1597.....Ibid.Stanhope,iv,f.162v.

Rich.Stanton: 1598(here).....PRO.E.179,44/312.

St.Mary Aldermary.

x Rich.Curtis: 1586(here).....SP.ii,182.

Wm.Cox: 1591.....Lambeth.Reg.Whitgift,i,f.19

x Wm.Graves: 1591.....Ibid.f.180v.

Rich.Gawton: 1596-8.....GLMS.6574,ff.5r,10r.

St.Mary at Hill.

J.Bunton: 1561(here).....Mullins,278.

Th.Harrold: 1567-75(here).....MS.9051/3,f.215v.

- Herman: 1586(here).....MS.9537/6,f.118v.

Rob.Jennings: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.114r.

St.Mary Islington.

Rich.Weston: 1561(here).....Mullins,272.

Anthony Clark: 1564(here).....MS.9171/15,f.215v.

- Oxenfell: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Th.Harding: 1576(here).....MS.9171/16,f.290r.

J.Glasse: 1577.....Lib.VG.Hamond,92v.

Francis Roberts: 1579-83(here)....Ibid.f.191v.

Rich.Lloyd: 1585-92(here).....Ibid.Stanhope,iii,f.87v.

Chris.Hailes: 1595(here)....Lib.Examin.1597-1600 (Jan.27, 1898)

x Anthony Watson: 1596-8(here)...Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.97v.

St.Mary Mounthaw.

Alexander Smelly: 1574(here).....Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.211v.

x Owen Jones: 1586(here).....SP.ii,182.

Chris.Hailes: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.80r.

St.Mary Somerset.

x David Jones: 1591.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.18r.

Chris.Hailes: 1592(here)....MS.9537/8,f.80v.

Wm.Hickocks: 1597-8....Lib.Examin.1597-1600,(Oct.23,1899).

x Th.Whitehand: 1598-1601(here)....MS.9051/5,f.186v.

St.Mary Staining.

Th.Jay: 1560(here).....Mullins,263.

Rowland Herring: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

J.Thirkell: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

St.Mary Staining.(continued)

Wm.Hickocks: 1584.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.30r.

[x]George Blackbird: 1589.....Ibid.f.317r.

St.Mary Woolchurch.

Th.Bendlow: 1573.....GLMS.1013/1,f.22v.

[x]Wm.Bedill: 1595-8(here).....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.11r.

St.Mary Magdalene Milk Street.

Wm.Martin: 1565-6.....GLMS.2596/1,f.135r.

J.Hall: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Wm.Paget: 1579.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.187v.

Th.Atkinson: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

St.Mary Magdalene Old Fish Street.

Rob.Jones: 1561(here).....Mullins,274.

- Cross: 1563(here).....MS.9171/15,f.209r.

Roger Alleyn: 1567(here).....MS.9051/3,f.209v.

Walter Kelly: 1571(here).....Ibid.f.268r.

[x]James Stopes: 1579-86.....MS.9051/4,f.172r.

St.Matthew Friday Street.

J.Denton: 1573(here).....PRO.E.179,43/288.

St.Michael Bassishaw.

Charles Wentworth: 1561(here)-76(died)..Mullins,271; Register,[1]151.

Francis Kitchen: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Wm.Smith: 1585(here)...LCCRO.Lib.Cort.1583-6,xvi,f.10v.

Ed.Tegyn(Taggin): 1586(here)....SP.ii,183.

[x]Ed.Griffith: 1589.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.248v.

[x]Francis Burley: 1590.....MS.9535/2,f.50r.

[x]Th.Reade: 1591-2(here).....MS.9537/8,f.79v.

Th.Scott: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

---

(1).The Registers of...St.Michael Bassishaw,1538-1625, ed. A.W.Hughes Clarke. Harleian Soc.LXXII (1942),Pt.i.

St.Michael Cornhill.

James Norris: 1560-1(here).....Mullins,258,276.
- Croft: 1566(here).....GLMS.4072/1,f.4r.
J.Morgan: 1571-4(here)....PRO.E.179,43/288;MS.9171/16,f.160
x David Dee: 1577.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.93r.
Wm.Maldon: 1582(here).....PRO.E.179,43/298.
Rob.Sherington: 1577-83...MS.9537/4-5(no fol.)
Hugh Smith: 1583-4.....MS.4072/1,f.28r.
Th.Austin: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.114v.
x Rich.Cowdall: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.85v.
x J.Vickers: 1593/98(here).....MS.4072/1,f.61v.

St.Michael Crooked Lane.

x Edmund Stanhawe: 1583.....MS.9535/2,f.21v.
- Walepoole: 1586(here).....SP.ii,183.

St.Michael Queenhithe.

Rob.Russell: 1573(here).....PRO.E.179,43/287.
Francis Shackleton: 1574(here)....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
George Ashbourne: 1586(here).....SP.ii,183.
Chris.Hawes: 1591.....MS.9535/2,f.54v.
Th.Jones: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.80r.
x Rob.Hunt: 1594.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,ii,f.184v.

St.Michael Wood Street.

Th.Francklyn: 1561(here).....Mullins,271.
Ambrose Golding: 1580(here)...Lib.VG.Hamond,f.192r.

St.Mildred Bread Street.

Th.Earl: 1561-4.....CUL.MS.Mm.1,29,f.45r.

St.Mildred Poultry.

J.Beldom: 1570 (died)(1)
Wm.Jones: 1573(here).....MS.9171/16,f.123r.

---

(1).Th.Milbourn, The History of...St.Mildred the Virgin, Poultry.(1872),34.

St.Nicholas Acon.

Th.Walbutt: 1560(here).....Mullins,258.
Edmund Austin: 1561-4(here)[1]
x Th.Edmunds: 1571 (departed)....MS.9171/16,f.78r.
Rob.Brinkeshire: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.120v.
x Rich.Allison: 1590.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.340v.
Rob.Halton: 1591.....Ibid.ii,f.18r.
x Rob.Elliott: 1591.....Ibid.f.22v.

St.Nicholas Cole Abbey.

Peter Baker: 1561-3(here).....Mullins,273.
J.Turke: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
J.Clarke: 1598.....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Nicholas Olave.

Rob.Feron: 1560(here).....Mullins,265.
x Humphrey Brokelsby: 1561-2(here)....Ibid.282.
Rich.Gough: 1575(here).....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.31v.
Wm.Williams: 1589-93(here)...MS.9537/7,f.120v.
Th.Atkinson: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)
Henry Holmes: 1602.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,v,f.73r.

St.Olave Hart Street.

x Edmund Thompson: 1560(here).....Mullins,262.
Th.Riley: 1563(here)...Register,Harleian Soc.XLVI (1916)106.
Rob.Bucberd: 1564-7(here).....Ibid.108;MS.9051/3,f.200v.
J.Lenvell: 1570.....Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.156r.
Nicholas Petifer: 1571-9(resigned)...LCCRO.Lib.Act.1579-81, f.84v.
J.Glasse: 1579.....Ibid.f.84v.
Miles Barrow: 1580(here).....Ibid.f.181r.
J.Bergerius: 1589(here).....Register,14.
x Rob.Skelton: 1598-1600.....Register,18-20.

---

(1). The Register Book of the Parish of St.Nicholas Acons, London, transcribed by W.Brigg,(Leeds,1890),88.

St.Olave Jewry.

Rich.Atherton: 1561(here).....Mullins,282.

[x]J.Downham: 1598.....MS.9535/2,f.87r.

St. Olave Silver Street.

James Stone: 1585 (departed)...Lib.Corr.1583-6,xvi,f.3v.

- Spendlove: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.108r.

[x]Wm.Becket: 1589.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.295v.

St.Pancras Soper Lane.

- Horton: 1586(here).....SP.ii,183.

St.Peter Cornhill.

Wm.Grey: 1560(here).....MS.9171/15,f.41v.

J.Fidens: 1578(here).....MS.9051/4,f.140v.

Th.Marbury: 1583-6.....MS.4165,p.60.

[x]Rob.Dixon: 1586-9(here).....SP.ii,183;MS.9537/7,f.115v.

St.Peter le Poer.

Rich.Lea (Leus): 1561(here)...Mullins,282;MS.9171/15,f.60r.

John.Brawler: 1586(here).....SP.ii,183.

St.Peter Paul's Wharf.

Th.Curtis: 1564 (here).....MS.9051/3,f.111r.

[x]Owem Jones: 1586.....Ibid.Stanhope,i,f.112r.

George Ashbourne: 1598.....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Peter West Cheap.

Wm. Porrage: 1561(here)-9(here)..Mullins,269;MS.9051/3, f.162r.

J.Hall: 1574(here)-77(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Jasper Frewell: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Samuel Cottesford: 1586(here)...MS.645/1,f.119r.

J.Brawler: 1586(here).....SP.ii,183.

Th.Pratt: 1587-92(here)....GLMS.645/1,f.123r.

Th.Bendish: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Sepulchre.

Wm.Hastlin: 1561-3(here)..Mullins,270;MS.9171/15,f.139v.

St.Sepulchre.(continued),
Wm.Margetts: 1563(here)[1].....MS.9171/15,f.151r.
Rich.Weston: 1569(here).....MS.9171/15,f.329v.
J.Dodd:[1]1569-78(here).....Ibid.f.361v;16,f.383v.
Geo.Boston: 1570-1(here)....Ibid.16,f.24r.
J.Silvester: 157 2-3(here)....Ibid.f.107v.
- Barber: 1574(here).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)
Henry Bradley: 1579.....MS.9535/2,f.10r.
J.Douglas: 1580(here).....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)
Rob.Rogers: 1581-1603(died)...Cons.Ct.Sperin,f.389v.
Wm.Daunsey: 1597:.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.134r.
xTh.Bingham: 1597-8(here).....Ibid.v,f.18r.
J.Boon: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)
Wm.Hickocks: 1599....Lib.Examin.1597-1600 (no fol.)
sub. Oct.23,1899.

St.Stephen Colemam Street. (Supra Appendix A.)

St.Stephen Walbrook.
Th.Mitchell: 1561(here).....Mullins,281.
xJames Varnam: 1597-8(here)....Lib.VG.Stanhope,iv,f.1v.

St.Swithin.
J.Linch: 1560(here).....Mullins,257.
Wm.Grimsditch: 1561.....Ibid.281.
Henry Holteby: 1561-8(died)...Cons.Ct.Bullock,f.108r.
Rich.Waddesworth: 1574-5(here)...MS.9171/16,f.205v.
J.Brawler: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
Rich.Maddocks: 1602.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,v,f.82v.

St.Thomas Apostle.
Rich.Limborow:[2]1561-2(here)..Mullins,274;MS.9051/3,f.14r.
J.Pitt: 1568-70(here).....MS.9051/3,f.249r.

---

(1).Described as "reader of the mornynge prayer",(MS.9171/15, ff.151r.,361v.)

(2).Very likely, the un-identified Marian exile of that name (Lynbroughe).(Garrett,op.cit.222).

St.Thomas Apostle.(continued).

Wm.Gibson: 1574 (departed).....MS.9537/3 (no fol.)

Rich.Braderton: 1573-7(here)....MS.9537/4 (no fol.)

Miles Barrow: 1579.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.161v.

Rich.Colman: 1580-3(died)...Register,Harleian Soc.vi (1881), 95.

Alex.Forsyth: 1583.....Lib.VG.Hamond,f.332v.

Philip Barton: 1586(suspended)(1)

Th.Dunscomb: 1586(here).....MS.9537/6,f.113v.

xReginald Brown: 1589.....Lib.VG.Stanhope,i,f.262r.

xJ.Eborne: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.87r.

Henry Hughes: 1597-8(here)...Lib.VG.Stanhope,iv,f.17r.

Matthew Palmer: 1598.....MS.9535/2,f.89v.

St.Vedast.

xJ.Reeve: 1588.....MS.9535/2,f.41v.

---

(1).He was suspended for adultery in March,1586 (LCCRO.Lib. Corr.1583-6, xvii,f.2v.)

APPENDIX C.

PARISH LECTURERS: OUTSIDERS.(1)

All Hallows Barking. — Sources.

Roger Sims: 1583(here).....GLMS.9537/5 (no fol.)

James Stile: 1589-90.....GLMS.9234/2,f.83r.(2nd fol. section)

Edward Beck: 1591-3.....Ibid.9234/4;MS.9537/8,f.82v.

Anthony Wootton: 1598-1626(died).....DNB.

All Hallows Less.

J.Wilson: 1587.....SP.ii,225.

All Hallows Staining.

George Cheston: 1581-3(here).....GLMS.4956/2,f.108r; MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

St.Alphage.

Wm.Cooper: 1590-1603.....GLMS.1432/3,ff.35v.et seq.

St.Andrew Holborn.

- Kelne: 1569(here).....LCCRO.Lib.VG.Huick,f.232r.

Matthew Heaton: 1583-5....GLMS.4249,ff.235v.-238v.

Thomas Nunne: 1586.....GLMS.9537/6,f.108r.

John Fabian: 1589(here)...MS.9537/7,f.103r.

St.Andrew Undershaft.

John Oliver: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.110v.

- Miller: 1593(here).....C.Burrage,The Early English Dissenters (1912),ii,35.

St.Andrew Wardrobe.

John Eborne: 1596(here).....MS.9234/6,f.72v.

---

(1).To include lecturers who neither held a curacy nor were beneficed in the parish where they preached.

St.Antholin.[1]

J.Gough: 1566 (ejected)...Stowe's Memoranda,Camden Soc. (1880),139.
J.Philpot: 1566 (ejected)...Ibid.139.
Rob.Crowley: 1566 (ejected)...Ibid.139.
Wm.Palmer: 1566(here)...Bodl.MS.Tanner,50,10,f.63v.
Rob.Crowley: 1576-8...GLMS.1046/1,ff.6r.-7v.
- Carr: 1579-81.....Ibid.ff.9v.-15r.
Andrew Castleton: 1583-5.....Ibid.ff.23v.-26r.
J.Morecroft: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
J.Haulton: 1583(here).....Ibid.
James Stile: 1586(here).....MS.9537/6,f.108v.
J.Duffield: 1586(here).....Ibid.f.108r.
Rich.Benbow: 1584-90[2]....MS.1046/1,ff.26r.-38r.
- Lewis: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.103v.
- Smith: 1589(here).....Ibid.f.103v.
Th.Pratt: 1590-2.....MS.1046/1,ff.38r.-43v.
J.Oliver: 1591-3.....Ibid.ff.40r.-45v.
Wm.Graves: 1591:.....Ibid.f.40r.
Rob.Harland: 1592.....Ibid.f.45v.
J.Eborne: 1593.....Ibid.f.48v.
Nicholas Alsop: 1593-8(here)...Ibid.f.48v;MS.9537/9,f.162r.
- Eaton: 1594(here).....MS.1046/1,f.50r.
Ed.Spendlove: 1594-1630(died)[3]....Ibid.f.51v.
Ed.Beck: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9,f.162r.

---

(1).This is the fullest available list, but is far from complet There were probably three morning lecturers here throughout the reign until 1584,only one,however,was named in the church-wardens' accounts,which survive only from 1574. Post 1594,no names are specified.
(2).He was also curate here 1589.
(3).The parish register describes him as having been lecturer for 45 years,ie.since 1585, but his name does not appear until 1594.

St.Anne Blackfriars.

Stephen Egerton: 1583-1604 (suppended)[1]...Lib.Examin 1597-1600 (no fol.) sub Nov.14,1597.

St.Augustine.

- White: 1583 (departed).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

Arthur Bright: 1583.....Ibid.

- Cooper: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.104v.

- Jacob: 1597 (inhibited)...Lib.VG.Stanhope,iii,f.161v.

- Hurleston: 1598(here).....MS.9537/9,f.157r.

St.Bartholomew Exchange.

- Sibthorp: 1585.....VM.ed.E.Freshfield (1890),17.

St.Benet Gracechurch.

J.Childersey: 1598.....GLMS.1568,p.378.

St.Benet Paul's Wharf.

- Goodwin: 1601.....LCCRO.Lib.Corr,1601-2,f.15r.

J. Vicars: 1601 (inhibited).....Ibid.f.15r.

St.Botolph Aldgate.

Duncan Anderson: 1584-6.....GLMS.9234/1,f.15v.

Christopher Threlkeld: 1587-94...MS.9234/1,f.135r.(2nd fol section)

Wm.Hubbock: 1597-8.....MS.9234/6,f.107v.

Eusebius Paget: 1598-1602(here)...MS.9234/7,f.135r; MS 9235/2 f.6 sub April, 160:

St.Botolph Aldersgate.

J.Bullingham: 1564-5.....GLMS.1454,Nos.68-9.

James Young: 1569-74.....Ibid.Nos.72-6.

St.Bride.

Rob.Temple: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.105r.

---

(1).For his suspension, see Two Elizabethan Diaries,ed. M.M. Knappen (Chicago, 1933),31.

Christ Church.[1]

Richard Allen: 1560-5 (removed)
James Young: 1565-7.
- White: 1567-71.
Wm.Pilesworth: 1571-4.
- Fletcher: 1574-5.
Ed.Leyfield: 1576-7.
Chris.Rosedale: 1578-9.
Th.Gatiacre: 1579-81.
The 4 preachers[2]: 1581-2: Gatiacre, Rosedale, George Dickens, J.King.
1583: Gatiacre, Rosedale(¾ year),Rich.Bond(½ yr.), J.Kingston(¼ yr.),Dickens(½ yr.),King(½ yr.), Francis Scarlet(¼ yr.),Wm.Wells(¼ yr.)
1584: Gatiacre, Wells, Scarlet(¾ yr.),Bond(¾ yr.) Wm.Scott(¼ yr.),David Dee(¼ yr.)
1585-9: Gatiacre, Scott, Dee, Wells.
1590-1: Gatiacre, Scott, Dee, Th.Austin.
1592: Gatiacre, Dee, J.Haulton(½ yr.), Th.Man(½ yr.), J.Richards.
1593: Dee, Man, Gatiacre(½ yr.), Th.Pratt(½ yr.), Richards(½ yr.), J.Oliver(½ yr.)
1594-5: Dee, Oliver, Pratt, J.Thomson.
Also 1591-4 (died): Richard Greenham...GLMS.9163,f.305r; ...St.Bart.Rec.Office,H.a.1/3,f.186r.
1598(here): - Millard; - Argall,...MS.9537/9,f.159r.

St.Clement Eastcheap.
Ed.Leyfield: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

---

(1).Information drawn from the journals and ledgers of the governors of St.Bartholomew's Hospital.(St.Barts.Rec.Office H.a.1/1-2; H.b.1/1-2.)
(2).Four singing priests at the church were replaced by 4 preachers in 1581. They were restored in 1595 according to the intent of the foundation of Henry VIII that endowed them

St.Dunstan in the East.
Wm.Ashbold: 1572-c.83.....MS.4887,pp.197-235.
- King: 1583:.....Ibid.p.235.

St.Edmund Lombard Street.
George Phillips: 1590(here).....MS.9234/2,f.112r.

St.Gabriel Fenchurch.
Michael Selford: 1598 (departed)....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Giles Cripplegate.
- Bartlett: 1565-6 (suspended)(1)

St.Helen's Bishopsgate.
Th.Barber: 1576-8.....GLMS.6836,ff.23v-27r.
- Gardiner: 1578-81.....Ibid.ff.27r.-35v.
J.Thorpe: 1581.....Ibid.f.35v.
- Curtis: 1585.....Ibid.f.42v.

St.James Clerkenwell.
Lawrence Barker: 1598-9.....MS.9537/9,f.159v.

St.Katherine Coleman.
George Chesterton: 1583(here)...MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

St.Katherine Cree.
Duncan Anderson: 1589(here)....MS.9234/2,f.44r.
David English: 1591(here).....MS.9234/3,f.129r.

St.Lawrence Jewry.
John Bullingham: 1565-6.....GLMS.2590/1,p.26.
Ed.Dering (proposed): 1570(2)....Ibid.p.33.

St.Magnus.
George Closse: 1583(here)....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

---

(1).The Remains of Edmund Grindal,ed.W.Nicholson, Parker Soc. (Cambridge 1848),288.

(2).There is no indication that Dering took up the lecturer-ship offered him.

St.Margaret Lothbury.

Rob.Crowley: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

St.Margaret New Fish Street.

Rob.Crowley: 1577(here)-8.....GLMS.1176/1 (no fol.)

James Stile: 1578-82.....Ibid.

Th.Edmunds: 1582-90.....Ibid.

St.Margaret Pattens.

- Heaton: 1587-8.....GLMS.4570/a,p.174.

- Anderson: 1588 (removed).....Ibid.p.175.

St.Martin Ludgate.

Stephen Gosson: 1584-5 (departed)(1)

Richard Salt: 1586.....GLMS.1311/1,f.83v.

Ed.Beck: 1594-5(here)....MS.9234/4,f.236v.

Nicholas Alsop: 1598(here)...MS.9537/9,f.160r.

St.Martin Orgar.

J.Tomson: 1590-3.....GLMS.959/1,ff.61r,62v.

Henry Holland: 1593.....Ibid.f.64v.

St.Martin Vintry.

- Dicks: 1586(here).....MS.9537/6,f.125r.

Evan Griffin: 1598(here)....MS.9537/9 (no fol.)

St.Mary Aldermanbury.

Nunne: 1586 (inhibited)...GLMS.3556/1,p.174.

Anderson: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.106v.

St.Mary Aldermary.

J.Field: 1581-5 (suspended)(2)

J.Dodd: 1596-7.....GLMS.6574,f.2r.

Wm.Charke: 1597 (removed)(3)...Ibid.f.3v.

---

(1).W.Ringler,Stephen Gosson,Princeton Studies in English (1942),42.

(2).For this dating, see Chapter XI,p.544,note 2.

(3).Very likely he was inhibited from preaching by the authorities,for the church wardens accounts record his being summoned before the High Commissioners (GLMS.6574,f.3v.)

St.Mary le Bow.

Henry Wright: 1566(here)....Bodl.MS.Tanner,50,10,f.49v.
Th.Barber: c.1581-4 (suspended)...SP.ii,220;Egerton MS.1693, f.103r.

St.Mary Woolchurch.

Th.Barber: 1581-2(here).....GLMS.593/2,f.2r.
Th.Crooke: 1583-91.....GLMS.1013/1,ff.42r,62r.

St.Mary Woolnoth.

J.Bateman: 1577 (departed)....GLMS.1002/1,f.185v.
Wm.Wager: 1577-8.....Ibid.f.185v.
Th.Spering: 1578-80.....Ibid.ff.201v,216v.
Ed.Leyfield: 1581-2.....Ibid.f.223r.
Th.Edmunds: 1583-5.....Ibid.f.232r.
- Burley: 1585-6.....Ibid. (no fol.)
Wm.Harris: 1586-9.....Ibid. (no fol.)
- Vaughan: 1590-1.....Ibid. (no fol.)
- Smith: 1592.....Ibid. (no fol.)
- Brown: 1592.....Ibid. (no fol.)
J.Eborne: 1593-4.....Ibid. (no fol.)
Nicholas Alsop: 1594-9.....Ibid.f.317r.

St.Michael Cornhill.

Ed.Leyfield: 1583 (died).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)
- Keltridge: 1583.....GLMS.4072/1,f.116v.
- Anderson: 1584-5.....Ibid.ff.34r.,122r.

St.Michael Paternoster.

Th.Sampson: 1575 (resigned)....Lansd.MS.19,72.

Minories.

See Tomlinson for list of preachers.(1)

---

(1).E.M.Tomlinson, A History of the Minories (1907),220.

Minories. (continued).

Some additions:

George Cheston: 1577 (imprisoned)....Tomlinson,166.

Wm.Bangr: 1583(here).....MS.9537/5 (no fol.)

Brian Atkinson: 1591 (departed)...MS.9234/2, f 109r (2nd foliation)

J.Shorie: 1593(here).....MS.9234/4,f.103r.

George Cheston: 1595(here)...Tomlinson,211.

J.Fulthorpe (senior): 1596 (suspended)...~~MS.9234/~~ Ibid Rec.

St.Nicholas Acon.

Rich.Allison: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.120v.

St.Olave Jewry.

J.Davidson: 1585-6 (inhibited).....GLMS.4409/1,ff.2r-4v.

Andrew Castleton: 1589(here).....MS.9537/7,f.108v.

Wm.Brook: 1592(here).....MS.9537/8,f.81r.

St.Sepulchre.

& Baker: 1587(here).....MS.9234/1,f.147r.

APPENDIX D.

A LIST OF LONDON PARISH CHURCHES.

Presentative Rectories.

All Hallows Honey Lane.
All Hallows London Wall.
All Hallows the Great.
Holy Trinity the Less.
St.Alban Wood Street.
St.Andrew Holborn.
St.Andrew Hubbard.
St.Andrew Wardrobe.
St.Bartholomew Exchange.
St.Bartholomew the Great.
St.Benet Sherehog.
St.Edmund Lombard Street.
St.Gabriel Fenchurch.
St.George Botolph Lane.
St.John Baptist Walbrook.
St.Leonard Foster Lane.
St.Margaret Lothbury.
St.Margaret Moses.
St.Margaret Pattens.
St.Martin Iremonger Lane.
St.Martin Outwich.
St.Martin Vintry.
St.Mary Abchurch.
St.Mary at Hill.
St.Mary Mounthaw.
St.Mary Somerset.
St.Mary Staining.
St.Mary Woolchurch.
St.Mary Woolnoth.
St.Michael Cornhill.
St.Michael Wood Street.
St.Mildred Bread Street.
St.Mildred Poultry.
St.Nicholas Acon.
St.Nicholas Coleabbey.
St.Olave Hart Street.
St.Peter West Cheap.
St.Peter Cornhill.
St.Peter in the Tower.
St.Stephen Walbrook.
St.Swithin.

Representative Vicarages.

All Hallows Barking.
Christ Church, Newgate Street.
St.Bartholomew the Less.
St.Bride.
St.Dunstan in the West.
St.Lawrence Jewry.
St.Leonard Shoreditch.
St.Mary Islington.
St.Olave Jewry.
St.Sepulchre.
St.Stephen Coleman Street.

Rectories in the Collation of the Bishop of London.

St.Alphage.
St.Andrew Undershaft.
St.Anne and St.Agnes.
St.Christopher le Stocks.
St.Clement Eastcheap.
St.Ethelburgha.
St.James Garlickhithe.
St.Katherine Coleman.
St.Magnus.
St.Margaret New Fish Street.
St.Martin Ludgate.
St.Matthew Friday Street.

Rectories in the Collation of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's.

St.Antholin.
St.Augustine.
St.Benet Gracechurch.
St.Benet Paul's Wharf.
St.Botolph Billingsgate.
St.John Zachary.
St.Martin Orgar.
St.Mary Magdalene Milk Street.
St.Mary Magdalene Old Fish Street.
St.Michael Bassishaw.
St.Michael le Querne.
St.Michael Queenhithe.
St.Nicholas Olave.
St.Olave Silver Street.
St.Peter Paul's Wharf.
St.Peter le Poer.
St.Thomas Apostle.

Collative Rectory, Peculiar of the Bishop of London.

St.Botolph Bishopsgate.

Peculiars of the Dean and Chapter of St.Paul's.

i).Collative rectories.

St.Faith.

ii).Collative vicarages.

St.Giles without Cripplegate.
St.Gregory.
St.Helen Bishopsgate.(?)

Peculiars of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

i).Rectories in the Collation of the Archbishop.

All Hallows Bread Street.
St.Dunstan in the East.
St.Mary Aldermary.
St.Mary le Bow.
St.Michael Crooked Lane.
St.Pancras Soper Lane.
St.Vedast.

ii).Presentative rectories in the gift of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.

All Hallows Lombard Street.

ii) (continued).

St.Dionis Backchurch.
St.John Evangelist.
St.Leonard Eastcheap.
St.Mary Bothaw.
St.Michael Paternoster.

Perpetual Curacies.

All Hallows Staining.
All Hallows the Less.
Holy Trinity Minories.
St.Anne Blackfriars.
St.Benet Finck.
St.Botolph Aldersgate.
St.Botolph without Aldgate.
St.James Clerkenwell.
St.Katherine Cree.
St.Lawrence Pountney.
St.Mary Aldermanbury.
St.Mary Colechurch.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources.

A. Manuscripts.

(1) Guildhall, City Corporation Library.

Episcopal Registers (MS. 9531/13)
Grindal Aylmer
Sandys Bancroft

Ordination Books (MSS. 9531/1-2)

Liberi Visitationum (MSS. 9537/2-11)

1561	1586	1607
1574	1589	1612/15
1577/80	1592	
1583	1598	

Archdeaconry Court
Liber Actorum 1562-3 (MS. 9055)
Marriage Allegations: Deposition Bk. 1566 (MS. 9056)
Will Registers (MS. 9051/3-5)

Commissary Court
Testamentary Cases 1581-93 (Responsa Personalia) (MS. 9585)
Will Registers (MS. 9171/15-18)

Parish Records
Registers.

All Hallows Less	...	(MS. 5160/1)
Holy Trinity Minories	...	(MS. 9238)
St. Anne Blackfriars	...	(MS. 4508-10)
St. Benet Finck..	...	(MS. 4097)
St. Botolph Aldgate	...	(MSS. 9221-3)
St. Bride ...	...	(MS. 630)
St. Giles Cripplegate	...	(MS. 6138/1)
St. Mary Bothaw..	...	(MS. 4310)
St. Mary Colechurch	...	(MS. 4438/1)
St. Peter le Poer	...	(MS. 4093/1)

Church-Wardens Accounts

All Hallows London Wall...		1566-1600	(MS. 5090/2)
All Hallows Staining	...	1533-1628	(MS. 4956/2)
Holy Trinity Less	...	1583-1662	(MS. 4835/1)
St. Alban Wood St	...	1584-1675	(MS. 7673/1)

St. Alphage ...	1533-1631	(MS. 1432/2-3)
St. Andrew Hubbard ...	1525-1 21	(MS. 1279/2)
St. Andrew Wardrobe ...	1570-1686	(MS. 2088/1)
St. Antholin ...	1574-1708	(MS. 1046/1)
St. Benet Gracechurch ...	1548-1722	(MS. 1568)
St. Benet Paul's Wharf...	1565-1648	(MS. 878/1)
St. Botolph Aldersgate...	1467-1635	(MS. 1454)
St. Botolph Billingsgate.	1603-1674	(MS. 942/1)
St. Botolph Bishopsgate..	1567-1632	(MS. 4524/1)
St. Botolph Aldgate ...	1547-1691	(MS. 9235/1-2)
St. Dunstan in the West..	1516-1607	(MS. 2968/1)
St. Ethelburgha ...	1569-1681	(MS. 4241/1)
St. George Botolph Lane..	1590-1675	(MS. 951/1)
St. Helen's Bishopsgate ...	1565-1654	(MS. 6836)
St. James Garlickhithe...	1555-1627	(MS. 4816/1)
St. John Walbrook ...	1595-1679	(MS. 577/1)
St. John Zachary ...	1591-1682	(MS. 590/1)
St. Lawrence Jewry ...	1579-1640	(MS. 2593/1)
St. Lawrence Pountney ...	1530-1681	(MS. 3907/1)
St. Margaret New Fish St.	1576-1678	(MS. 1176/1)
St. Margaret Pattens ...	1558-1653	(MS. 4570/2)
St. Martin Orgar ...	1471-1615	(MS. 959/1)
St. Mary Aldermanbury ...	1569-1592	(MS. 3556/1)
St. Mary Aldermary ...	1597-1665	(MS. 6574)
St. Mary Woolchurch ...	1560-1672	(MS. 1013/1)
St. Mary Woolnoth ...	1539-1641	(MS. 1002/1)
St. Mary Magdalene Milk St.	1518-1605	(MS. 2596/1)
St. Matthew Friday St....	1547-1678	(MS. 1016/1)
St. Michael Cornhill ...	1455-1608	(MS. 4071/1)
St. Olave Jewry ...	1586-1705	(MS. 4409/1)
St. Peter West Cheap ...	1441-1601	(MS. 645/1)
St. Stephen Coleman St.	1586-1640	(MS. 4457/2)
St. Stephen Walbrook ...	1549-1637	(MS. 593/2)
St. Swithin ...	1602-1725	(MS. 559/1)

Vestry Minutes.

All Hallows Great ...	1574-1684	(MS. 819/1)
St. Alphage ...	1593-1608	(MS. 1431/1)
St. Benet Paul's Wharf...	1579-1674	(MS. 877)
St. Botolph Billingsgate.	1592-1673	(MS. 943/1)
St. Botolph Aldgate ...	1583-1640	(MS. 9236)
St. Dunstan in the East..	1515-1651	(MS. 4887)
St. Dunstan in the West..	1588-1663	(MS. 3016/1)
St. Helen's Bishopsgate..	1558- 78	(MS. 6836)
St. Lawrence Jewry ...	1556-1669	(MS. 2590/1)
St. Margaret Lothbury ...	1571-1677	(MS. 4352/1)
St. Margaret New Fish St.	1578-1789	(MS. 1175/1)
St. Martin Ludgate ...	1568-1715	(MS. 1311/1)

St. Mary Aldermanbury ...	1569-1609	(MS. 3570/1)
St. Matthew Friday St....	1576-1743	(MS. 3579)
St. Michael Cornhill ...	1563-1697	(MS. 4072/1)
St. Olave Jewry ...	1574-1680	(MS. 4415/1)
St. Peter Cornhill ...	1570-1717	(MS. 4165)
St. Stephen Walbrook ...	1587-1614	(MS. 594/1)

Miscellaneous.

All Hallows Staining
Rate Books 1539-1605 (MS. 4958/1)
Sacramental accounts, briefs, and collection book 1585-1664 (MS. 4959)

Christ Church, Newgate St.
Poor Rate Memoranda Bk. 1574-1698 (MS. 9163)

St. Andrew Holborn.
The Bancroft Book (MS. 4248)
Thomas Bentley's Remembrancia, 1584 (MS. 4249).

St. Botolph Aldgate.
Parish Clerk's Memoranda Bks., 1583-4; 1586-1600 (MS. 9234/1-7)
Account Book for the Ward (MS. 9236)

(ii) London County Council Record Office (unclassified record

Vicar-General Books
Huick
Hamond
Stanhope (5 vols)

Consistory Court
(a) Liberi Actorum

1565-9	1579-81
1569-72	1581-4
1575-7	1589-93
1577-9	1599-1605

(b) Liberi Examinationum Testium ac Partium Principalium

1566-8	1591-4	1608-9
1572-4	1597-1600	1609-11
1574-6	1600-3	1612-13
1586-91	1606-8	

(c) Liberi Correctionum
1583-6
1601-2
1605-6

Will Registers
Bullock
Sperin

St. Saviour's Southwark: parish records

(iii) London Corporation Record Office

Repertories of the Court of Aldermen
Vols. 14-25
Journals of the Court of Common Council
Vols. 17-21
Letter Books
S-Z
Remembrancia
1-2

(iv) Lambeth Palace Library

Archiepiscopal Registers.
Grindal; Whitgift.
Tenison MS. 711
Cartae Miscellaneae, I,VI,XII,XIII

(v) St. Paul's Cathedral Library

Additional MS. 1
Dean and Chapter Registers of Leases (Nowell, Overall)

(vi) Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House

Will Registers: Prerogative Court of Canterbury
Will Registers: Court of Dean and Chapter St. Paul's (A-B)

(vii) Public Record Office

State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth (SP. 12)
State Papers Domestic, Addenda, Edward VI to James I (SP. 15)
Court of Chancery (C.3/78/24)
Court of Requests (C. Req. 36,89)
Exchequer:
Clerical Subsidy Rolls (E.179 43-4)
Composition Books (E. 179 43-4)
Star Chamber (St.Ch.5 A 49/34)

(viii) British Museum (Miscellaneous documents)

Additional MSS.

4,736 29,546 48,039
12,222 32,092 48,064
28,571

Cotton MS
Titus C. VI

Egerton MS
1,693
2,350

Harleian MS.
595

Lansdowne MSS.
19; 28; 33; 45; 53; 61; 83; 109; 443-5

Sloane MS.
271

Stowe MS
270

(ix) St. Bartholomew's Hospital Record Office

Journals of the Court of Governors (Ha.1/1-3)
Ledgers " " " " " (Hb.1/1-2)
Repertories" " " " " (Hc. 2/3)
Church-wardens' accounts of St. Bartholomew the Less (1575-1614)

(x) Bermondsey Central Public Library

(Parish records of St. Olave Southwark

(xi) Bodleian Library, Oxford

Corpus Christi College MS. 318
Rawlinson MSS.
D. 399
D. 699
D. 993
D.1067
Tanner MSS.
50
79
179
427
Wood MS.
30-2

(xii) Cambridge University Library

Mm. 1.29 (partly transcribed MM. 1.38)
Mm. 1.43
Mm. 6.61

(xiii) Essex Record Office

Act. Books of the Court of the Archdeacon of Colchester (D/ACA)
Act. Books of the Court of the Archdeacon of Essex (D/AEA)
Parish book of Braintree (D/P 264/8/1)

(xiv) Hertfordshire Record Office

Act. Books of the Court of the Archdeacon of St. Albans 1561-1601 (ASA.3-16)
Miscellaneous Papers 1582-1600 (Box F)
Miscellaneous Papers (Box 1)
Gorhambury MS. viii/B/143

B. Printed Contemporary Documents and Texts.

(i) Parish Records

Brigg, W., The Register Book of the Parish of St. Nicholas Acons, 1539-1612 (1890)
Brooke, J.M.S. and Hallem, A.W.C., The Transcripts of the Registers...of St. Mary Woolnoth and St. Mary Woolchurch (1886)
Freshfield, E., The Parish of St. Christopher-le-Stocks and Unpublished Records of the City of London (1886)
Freshfield, E., The Vestry Minute Book of The Parish of St. Margaret Lothbury (1887)
Freshfield, E., The Vestry Minute Books of the Parish of St. Bartholomew Exchange in the City of London, 1567-1676 (1890)
Hallem, A.W.C., The Registers of St. Botolph Bishopsgate Vol. 1 (1889)
Harleian Society Registers:
Vol. i. St. Peter's upon Cornhill (1877)
iii. St. Dionis Backchurch (1878)
vi. St. Thomas Apostle (1881)
vii. St. Michael Cornhill (1882)
viii. St. Antholin (1883)
xvii. St. James Clerkenwell (1891)

xxi. Christ Church Newgate (1895)
xxx. St. Vedast Foster Lane (1903)
xxxi. St. elen's Bis opsgate (1904)
xlii. St. argaret Moses (1912)
xliii. All Hallows Bread St. (1913)
xliv. St. Mary Bow, All Hallows Honey Lane, and St. Pancras Soper Lane (1914)
xlvi. St. Olave Hart St. (1916)
xlix. St. Stephen Walbrook (1919)
lix-lx. St. Mary Some set (1929-30)
lxi. St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury (1931)
lxiii. St. Matthew Friday St. (1933)
lxix. St. Dunstan-in-the-East (1939)
lxx. St. Lawrence Jewry (1940)
lxxii. St. Mary Magdalene Milk St. and St. Michael Bassishaw (1942)

Jupp,E.B. and Hovenden,R., The Registers of Christening Marriages, and urials of the Parish of All Hallows London Wall (1878)

Overall, W.H., The Accounts of the Churchwardens of th Parish of St. Michael Cornhill (1871)

(ii) Sermons, Catechisms, Dialogues, and Discourses.[1]

Anderson,A., A Sermon preached at aule's Cross (1581)
A.,N. [Alsop,Nicholas], Certaine Briefe Questions and Answers...(1600)
[Anon.], A Briefe examination for the tyme...(1566)
[Anon.], Asinus Onustus The Asse Overladen (1642 editio
[Anon.], Sophronistes. A Dialogue... (1589)
Babington,G., Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse... (1591)
Balmford,J., A Short Catechisme (1607)
Barker,L., Christ's Checke to S.Peter... (1599)
Bedell,H., A Sermon Exhortyng to pitie the poore (1571)
Bisse,J., Two Sermons...the one at Poules Crosse (1580)
Bisse,J., A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1581)
Bredwell,S., The asing of the Foundations of Brownisme(158
Broughton,H., Works (1662 edition)
Browne,R., A Treatise upon 23 of Matthewe (1582)
Bush, E., A Sermon preached at Pauls crosse... (1576)
Carr,J., A larume ell for London (1573)
Cobhead,T., A Briefe Instruction... (1579)

---

1. Special attention has been paid to sermons delived at Paul's Cross and elsewhere in London. The great majority of the authors quoted were themselves City incumbents.

Cosin, R., Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation (1591)
Crowley, R., A Briefe d scourse against the outwards apparrell ... (1566)
Crowley, R., An Answere for the Tyme... (1566)
Crowley, R., A Sermon made in the Chappell at the Gylde Hall in London... (1575)
Deios,L., That the Pope is Antichrist (1590)
Dove, J., A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1594)
Dove, J., A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1596)
Dove, J., Of Divorcement. A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse (1601)
Dove, J., A Defence of Church Government (1606)
Downham, J., The Christian Warfare (1604)
Drant, T. Two Sermons preached... (1570 ?)
Drant, T., A fruitfull and necessary Sermon (1572)
Dyos, J., A sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1579)
Egerton, S., A Lecture preached...at the Blacke-friers... (1603 edition)
Egerton,S., A Briefe Methode of Catechizing (16th edition, 1610)
Fenton, R., A Sermon of Simonie and Sacriledge (1604)
Field, J., A Caveat for Parsons Howlet... (1581)
Fisher, W., A Sermon at Paules Crosse... (1580)
Fisher, W., A Godly Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1592)
Gosson, S., The Trumpet of Warre (1598)
Gough, J., Rules to bee exercised...of al Christs souldiers [Prologue only] (1561)
Gravet, W., A sermon preached at paules crosse... (1587)
Greenham,R., Works (1599)
Heasse, R., A Chrystian exhortation... (1566)
Holland,H., A treatise against witchcraft (Cambridge 1590)
Holland,H., Spirituall preseruatives against the pestilence (1593)
Holland,H., Aphorismes of Christian Religion (1590)
Holland,H., The Christian exercise of fasting (1596)
Hudson, J., A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse... (1584)
Keltridge,J., The Exposition and Readynges of John Keltridge (1578)
Marbury, F., A fruitful sermon preached at the Spittle (1602
Marbury, F., A sermon preached at Paules crosse (1602)
Nixon, A., Londons dove; or a memoriall of Maister R. Dove (1612)
Openshaw, R., Short questions and Answeares... (1584 edition)
Paget,Eusebius, A Godly Sermon Preached at Detford (1572)
Paget,Eusebius, A Godly and Fruitefull Sermon (c.1580)
Paget,Ephraim, Heresiography (1661 edition)
Philips, E., Certaine Godly and learned Sermons... (1605)
Phillips,G., The Paines of a faithfull Pastor (1596)

Pilkington,J., The Burnynge of Paules Church (1563)
Porder,R., A Sermon of gods fearfull threatnings for Idolatry... (1569-70)
Radcliffe,T., A Short Summe of the Whole Catechisme (1592)
Rosdall,C., A Godlie and short discourse (1589)
Sorocold.T., Supplication of Saints (1610 edition)
Stepney,W., The Spanish schoolemaster (1591)
Stockwood,J., A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse (1578)
Stockwood,J., A very fruiteful sermon... (1579)
Tanner,J., A Sermon preached at Paules Crosse (1596)
Temple,R. A Sermon...Preached at Paules Crosse (1592)
Tymme,T., A Discourse of ten English lepers (1592)
Tymme,T., The Poore Mans Paternoster (1598 reprint)
Tymme,T., A Silver Watch Bell (10th impression 1614)
Walsall.J., A Sermon Preached at Paul's Cross (1578)
Walton,B., A Treatise concerning the Payment of Tithes in London, Collectaneae Ecclesiastica, ed. S. Brewster (1752),1-231.
White,P., An Answere Vnto Certaine Crabbed Questions... (1582)
White,T., A Sermon Preached at Pawles (1578)
White,T., A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse (1589)
Wilcox,T., Works, (1624 edition).

(iii) Modern Editions of Sixteenth Century Texts

Brinkworth,E.R. (Ed.) The Archdeacon's Court: Liber Actorum, 1584, Oxford Rec.Soc. 23,24 (1942)

Camden, W., The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England (1668 edition)

Camden Soc. The Diary of Henry Machyn, 1550-1563,ed J.G.Nichols, xlii (1847)
The Diary of John Manningham, ed.J. Bruce, (1868)
Wriothesley's Chronicle of England, 1485-1559, ed. W.D.Hamilton, Vol.ii New Series,xx, (1877)
Three Fifteenth-Century Chronicles, ed. J.Gairdner, xxviii (1880)
The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. R.G.Usher, 3rd series viii (1905)

Cowper,J.M. (Ed.) The Lamentacyon of a Christen Against the Cytye of London, made by Roderigo Mors, Early English Text Soc. xxii(1904

Dale, T.C. (Ed.), The Inhabitants of London in 1638, 1, (1931)

Foxe, J., Actes and Monuments, ed. J.Pratt, 8 vols. (1870)

Frere,W.H. (Ed.), Registrum Matthei Parker, 3 vols (Cambridge 1928)

Frere,W.H. and Douglas,C.E.(Eds.), Puritan Manifestoes, Church Hist. Soc. lxxii (1907). Reprint Church Hist. Soc. (1954)

Harrison, W., Harrison's Description of England in Shakespere's Youth, ed. F.J.Furnivall, 2 vols. (1877-81)

Hoby, Margaret, Lady, The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599-1605, ed. Dorothy M. Meads (1930)

Hooker, R., The Works of that learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, ed. J.Keble. Seventh edition revised R.W.Church and F.Paget, 3 vols (Oxford 1888)

Kingsford,C.L. (Ed.), A Survey of London by John Stow, 2 vols. (Oxford 1908)

Kirk,R.E.G. and E.D.(Eds.), Return of Aliens...in London, Huguenot Soc. of London, x, 3 parts (Aberdeen 1902)

Knappen,M.M. (Ed.), Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries by Richard Rogers and Samuel Ward, American Soc. of Church History (Chicago 1933).

Nichols, J., The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols (1823)

Parker Society, The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, ed. J.Ayre (Cambridge 1842)
The Zurich Letters, ed. H.Robinson, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1842)
The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. W. Nicholson (Cambridge 1843)
Miscellaneous Writings of Thomas Cranmer ed. J.E.Cox (Cambridge 1846)
Remains of Myles Coverdale, ed. G. Pearson (Cambridge 1846)

J. Calfhill, An Answer to John Martiall's Treatise of the Cross, ed. R.Gibbings (Cambridge 1846)
Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, ed. H.Robinson, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1846)
The Works of John Jewel, ed. J.Ayre, iv. (Cambridge 1850)
Correspondence of Matthew Parker, 1535-1575, ed. J.Bruce (Cambridge 1853)
The Works of John Whitgift, ed. J.Ayre 3 vols. (Cambridge 1851-3)

Pell, A. (Ed), The Second Parte of a Register, 2 vols (Cambridge 1915)
Peel, A. and Carlson, L.H. (Eds.), Cartwrightiana, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, i (1951)
The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne, Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, ii (1953)

Penfold, P.A. (Ed.), Call Book for the Episcopal Visitation of the Diocese of Winchester 1581 and 1582, Surrey Record Soc. (1956)

Pierce, W. (Ed.), The Marprelate Tracts 1588, 1589 (1911)
Valor Ecclesiasticus, i (1810)

Williams, J.F. (Ed.), Bishop Redman's Visitation, 1597, Norfolk R c. Soc. xviii (1946)

(iv) Collected Documents and Reports.

Cardwell, E., A History of Conferences Oxford 1841)
" Synodalia, 2 vols. (Oxford 1842)
" Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England, 2 vols. (Oxford 1844)
City of London Livery Companies Commission, Report and Appendix, ii, (1884)

Croke, G., Reports, King's Bench and Common Pleas, i, (1669)

Dasent, J.R., Acts of the Privy Council of England, New Series, 32 vols. (1890-1907)
Endowed Charities (County of London), 8 vols. (1897)

Foster, C.W., Lincoln Episcopal Records in the time of Thomas Cooper...1571-84, Lincoln Rec. Soc. ii (Lincoln 1912)

Foster, C.W., — The State of the Church...[in] the Diocese of Lincoln, Lincoln Rec. Soc. xxiii (Horncastle 1926)

Frere,W.H. and Kennedy,W.P.M., — Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, Alcuin Club Collections xiv-xvi, 3 vols. (Oxford 1910)

Gee,H. and Hardy,W.J., — Documents Illustrative of English Churc History (1896)

Hale, W.H., — A Series of Precedents and Proceedings in Criminal Causes...1475-1640 (1847)

Kennedy,W.P.M., — Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, Alcuin Club Collections xxv-xxvii, 3 vols. (1924-5)

Nicolas, H., — Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton...Including his Correspondence (1847)

Sparrow.H., — A Collection of Articles (1684)

Spedding, J., — The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon.. 7 vols. (1861-74)
The Statutes of the Realm, iii-iv (1817 19)

Steele, R., — Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485-1714, 2 vols. (Oxford 1910)

(v.) Calendars and Catalogues.

Calendars of the Proceedings in Chancery in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols. (1827)
Calendars of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1547-1610 (7 vols.) and Addenda volumes 1547-1625 (2 vols.)
Calendars of the Patent Rolls,Elizabeth 1558-1564 2 vols. (1939-48)

Hall,H.R. Wilton (Ed.), — Records of the Old Archdeaconry of St. Alban's, A Calendar of Papers,A.D.1575 to A.D.1637, St. Alban's and Hertfordshire Architectural and Archaeological Soc. (St. Alban's 1908)

Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports.
Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury, Hatfield House, 18 vols (1888-1940)
Second Report
Ninth Report, Pt.1. Appendix (Report o MSS. of St. Paul's)
Various Collections, vii (1914) (Repor on MSS. of Bishop of London.

Inderwick, F.A., Calendar of Inner Temple Record, i (1896

Overall, W.H. (Ed.), Analytical Index to...The Remembrancia 1579-1664 (1878)
The Pilgrim Trust. Survey of Ecclesiastical Archives (1946) ii.

Pollard, A.W. and Redgrave, G.R. (Eds.), A Short-Title Catalogue...1475-1640 (1926)
Royal Commission on Public Records, Second Report (1914), Appendix.
Royal Commission on Public Records, Third Report (1919), Appendix. (Report on Ecclesiastical Archives in London)

Walker, J.D., The Records of the Honorable Soc. of Lincoln's Inn. The Black Books, i-ii (1897).

(vi) Biographical Sources.

Allan, G.A.T., Christ's Hospital Exhibitioners to the Universiti s (1924)
" Christ's Hospital Admissions, 2 vols. (1937)

Bannister, A.T., Diocese of Hereford Institutions (Hereford 1933)

Bullen, R.F., Catalogue of Beneficed Clergy of Suffolk, 1551-1631 (Ipswich, no date)

Clark, A., Register of the University of xford, ii 2 pts. (Oxford 1887)

Cooper,C.H. and T.,	Athenæ Cantabrigienses 1560-1609, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1858-1913)
Cox, J.C.,	An Elizabethan Clergy List of the Diocese of Lichfield, Derbyshire Archæological and Natural History Soc. Journal, vi.
Fielding, C.H.,	The Records of Rochester (Dartford 1910
Fletcher, R.J.,	The Pension Book of Gray's Inn, 1 (1901
Foster, C.W.,	Institution to Ecclesiastical Benefices in the County ofBedford, 1535-1660, Beds. Historical Records Soc. viii (1924), 133-164
Foster, J.,	Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714, 4 vols. (Oxford 1891-2[
Gibbons, A.,	Ely Episcopal Records (Lincoln 1891)
Goddman, A.W.,	Hampshire Incumbents in 1562, Hampshire Field Club Proceedings, xiv, Pt.1 (193
Harleian Soc.,	Visitation of London 1568, ed. J.J. Howard and G.J.Armytage, 1 (1869)
Hart, E.P.,	Merchant Taylors' School Register 1561-1934 (1936)
Hennessy, G.	Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense (1898)
"	Chichester Diocese Clergy Lists (1900)
	Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, British Record Soc. i-v (1893-1912)
Jones, W.H.,	Fasti Ecclesiae Sarisberiensis, 2 vols. (Salisbury 1879)
Le Neve, J. and Hardy, T.D.,	Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 2 vols. (Oxford 1854)
Longden, H.J.	Northamptonshire and Rutland Clergy from 1500, 16 vols. (Northampton 1938-1952)
Newcourt, R.,	Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense, 2 vols. (1708-10)

Noble, W.M., Incumbents of the County of Huntingdon (no date)

Pearce, S.S., The Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Oxford... [In] 1559 and Afterwards, Oxford Archaeological Soc., lxv (1920), 198-230

" A Certificate of the Oxford Clergy A.D. 1593, Oxford Arch. Soc., lix (1913), 145-70

Peile, J., iographical Register of Christ's College 1505-1905, i (Cambridge 1910)

Pryce, A.J., The Diocese of Bangor in the Sixteenth Century (Bangor 1923)

Robinson, C.J., A Register of the Scholars admitted into Merchant Taylors' School i. (Lewes, no date)

Saunders, H.W., A List of the Clergy of Norfolk and their Status, Original Papers of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Soc. xviii, Pt.1

Stephen, L. and Lee, S. (Eds.), Dictionary of National Biography 21 vols 2 supplements (1908-11 re-issue)

Thomas, D.R., A History of the Diocese of St. Asaph (1884)

Venn, J., Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College 1349-1897, i (Cambridge 1897)

Venn, J. and J.A., Alumni Cantabrigienses, Pt.1 (to 1718), 4 vols., (Cambridge 1922-7)

Walker, T.A., A Biographical Register of Peterhouse Men, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1927-30)

Weaver, F.W. Somerset Incumbents (Bristol 1889)

Y Bywgraffiadur Cymreig Hyd 1940 (gol. R.T.Jenkins). (1953).

2. Secondary Sources (Select)

A. Local and Parochial Histories.

Atkinson, A.G., St. otolph Aldgate: The Story of a City Parish (1898)

Carter, P.C., History of St. Mary the Virgin Aldermanbury (1913)

Cobb, W.F., The Church of St. Ethelburgha (1905)

Cornford, M.A., Paul's Cross: A History (1910)

Freshfield, E., On the Parish Books of St. Margaret Lothbury, St. Christopher-le-Stocks, and St. Bartholomew-by-the-Exchange (1876)

Hill, G.W. and Frere, W.H. (Eds.), Memorials of Stepney Parish (Guildford 1890-1)

Jamison, Catherine, The History of the Royal Hospital of St. Katharine (1952)

Jenkinson, W., London Churches Before the Great Fire (1917)

Lysons, D., The Environs of London, 5 vols (1792-1811)

Malcolm, J.P. Londinium Redivivum, 4 vols. (1802-3)

Matthews, W.R. and Atkins, W.M. (Eds.), A History of St. Paul's Cathedral (1957)

cMurray, W. The Records of Two City Paris es, St. Anne Aldersgate and St. John Zachary (1925)

Milbourn, T., he History of the Church of St. Mildred the Virgin, Poultry (1872)

Milman, H.H., Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral (1868)

Pinks, W.J., The History of Clerken ell (1865)

Povah, A., — The Annals of S . Olave Hart Street and All allows Staining (1894)

Simpson, W.S., — Notes on the History and Antiquities . of St. atthew Friday St. and St. Peter Cheap.
Chapters in the History of Old S. Paul's (1881)

Simpson, W.S. (ed.), — Documents Illustrating the History of St. Paul's Cathedral, Camden Soc.(1880

Smyth, C., — Church and Parish: Studies in Church Problems, illustrated from the Parochial History of St. Margaret's Westminster (1955)

Tomlinson, E.M., — A History of the Minories London (1907)

Walters, H.B. — London Churches at the Reformation (193

Webb, E.A., — The Records of St. Bartholomew's Priory and the Church and Parish of St. Bartholomew the Great, 2 vols (1921)

West, A.G.B., — The Church and Parish of St. Dunstan in the East (no date)

Wilson, H.B. — A History of the Parish of St. Lawrence Pountney (1831)

B. General (Books)

Addleshaw, G.W.O., and Etchells, F., — The Architec ural Setting of Anglican Worship (1948)

Bailey, D.S., — Thomas Bacon and the Reformation of the C urch in England (1952)

Bewes, W.A., — Church Briefs (1896)

Brett-James, N.G. — The Growth of S uart London (1935)

Brook, V.J.K., — Whitgift and the English C urch (1 57)

Brooks, St.John, — Sir Christopher Hatton (1946)

Burn, R., Ecclesiastical Law, 4 vols., (1797 edition)

Burrage, C., The Early English Dissenters In the Light o ecent esearch, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1912)

The True Story of Robert rowne (1906)

Calder, Isabel M., Activities of t e Puritan Faction of the Church of England, 1625-33 (1957)

Caspari, F., Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England (1954)

Churchill, Irene, J., Canterbury Administration, 2 vols. (1933

Collier, J., An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, Vol.ix (1852)

Davies, H.M., The Worship of the English Puritan (194

Davies, E.T., Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Sixteenth Century (Oxford 1950)

Dawley, P.M. John Whitgift and the Reformation (1955

Dietz, F.C. English Public Finance 1558-1641 (1930)

Dixon, R.W. History of the Church of England, vi (Oxford 1902)

Donaldson, G., The Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 (Edinburgh 1955)

Firth, C.H., A Commentary on Macaulay's istory of Engla d (1938)

Frere, W.H. The English Curch in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1904)

Fuller, T., The Church History of Britain, iv-v. (Oxford, 1845 edition)

Garrett, Christine H., The arian Exiles (Cambridge 1938)

Gee. H. The Elizabethan Clergy And the Settlement of Religion 1558-64 (Oxford 1898)

Gibson, E., Codex Juris Ecclesi stici Anglicani, 2 vols. (Oxford 1761)

Gregg, W.W., Some Aspects And Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650 (195(

Haller, W., The Rise of Puritanism (New York 1938)

Hartridge, R.A.R., Vicarages in the Middle Ages (Cambridge 1930)

Haweis, J.O.W. Sketches of The Reformation And Elizabethan Age (1844)

Heylyn, P., Cyprianus Anglicus (1668)

Higham, Florence, Southwark Story (1955)

Hill, C. Economic Problems of the Church From Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament (Oxford 1956)

Hughes, P., The Reformation in England, ii-iii (1953-4)

Hunter, J., An Introduction to the Valor Ecclesiasticus (1834)

Kennedy, W.P.M., Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth (1914
Studies in Tudor History (1916)

Knappen, M.M. Tudor Puritanism (Chicago 1939)

Lindeboom, J., Austin Friars. Trans. D. de Jongh (Hague 1950)

Lloyd, R., The Church of England in the Twentieth Century, 2 vols. (1946)

Lyndwood's Provinciale, ed. J.V.Bullard and H.C.Bell (1929)

Macaulay, Lord, The History of England From the Accession of James II, ed. T.F. Henderson (1907)

Makower, F., The Constitutional History And Constitution of the Church of England (1895)

Moore, N., The History of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, ii (1918)

Mozley, J.F.,	John Foxe and His Book (1940)
"	Coverdale and his Bibles (1953)
Neal, D.,	The History of the Puritans, 1 (1822)
Neale, J.E.,	Queen Elizabeth (1934)
"	The Elizabethan House of Commons (1949)
"	Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1559-1581 (1953)
"	Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1584-1601 (1957)
Ollard, S.L., and Crosse, G. (Eds.),	A Dictionary of English Church History (2nd ed. 1919)
Owst, G.R.,	Preaching in Medieval England (Cambridge 1926)
Page, W. (Ed.),	The Victoria History of London, 1 (190
Peel, A.,	Robert Crowley: Puritan, Printer, Pries The Presbyterian Historical Soc. of England (Manchester 1937)
"	The First Congregational Churches (Cambridge 1920)
Phillimore, W.G.F.,	The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England, 2 vols. (1895)
Pierce, W.,	An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts (1908)
Pollard, A.W. (Ed.),	Records of the English Bible (Oxford 1911)
Read, C.,	Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the policy of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols. (Oxford 1925)
Pulling, A.,	A Practical Treatise on the Laws, Customs, and Regulations of the City and Port of London (1842)
Purvis, M.S.,	An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records (1953)

Ratcliff, E.C., The Book of Common Prayer: Its Making and Revisions 1549-1661 (1949)

Read, C., [See p. 654]

Ringler, W., Stephen Gosson: A Biographical and Critical Study, Princeton Studies in English, 25 (1942)

Rosenberg, Eleanor, Leicester, Patron of Letters (New York 1955)

Rowse, A.L. Tudor Cornwall (1941)

" The England of Elizabeth (1950)

Scott Pearson, A.F., Thomas Cartwright And Elizabethan Puritanism (Cambridge 1925)

" Church and State. Political Aspects of Sixteenth Century Puritanis (Cambridg 1928)

Strype, J., Historial Collections of the Life and Acts of John Aylmer (Oxford 1821 edition)

" The History of the Life and Acts of... Edmund Grindal (Oxford 1821 edition)

" The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, 3 vols. (Oxford 1822 edition)

" Annals of the Reformation And Establishment of Religion..., 4 vols. (Oxford 1824 edition).

" The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, 3 vols (Oxford 1822 edition)

Sykes, N. Church and State in the Eighteenth Century (1931)

" Old Priest and New Presbyter (Cambridge 1956)

Tate, W.E., The Parish Chest (Cambridge 1946)

Tawney, R.H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (1938 edition)

Thompson,A.H., The English Clergy and their Organisation in the Lat r Middle Ages (Oxford 1947)

Usher, R.G., Reconstruction of the English Church, 2 vols. (New York 1910)

" The Rise and Fall of the High Commissic (Oxford 1913)

Ware, S.L., The Elizabethan Parish in its Ecclesias tical and Financial Aspects (Baltimore 1908)

Webb, S., and Beatrice, English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporatic Act, i (1924)

Williams, G., Bywyd ac Amserau'r Esgob Richard Davies (Caerdydd 1953)

Wilson, F.P., The Plague in Shakespeare's London (Oxford 1927)

Woodcock, B.L., Medieval Ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese of Canterbury (1952)

Wright, L.B., Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Chapel Hill, North Carolina 1935)

C. Articles and Essays

Bennett, H.S., Medieval Ordination Lists in the Englis Episcopal Registers, Studies Presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson, ed. J.C.Davie (1957), 20-34.

Brinkworth, E.R., The Study and use of archdeacons' court records, Transactions of the Royal Historical Soc. 4th series, xxv. (1943 93-119

Brooks, F.W., The Social Position of the Parson in th Sixteenth Century, Journal of the British Archaeological Soc. 3rd. serie x, 23-37.

Calder, Isabel M., A Seventeenth Century Attempt to Purify the Anglican Church, American Historica Review, liii, No.4 (1948), 760-75

Carruthers, S.W., The Presbytery at Sandsworth, Transactions of the Congregationalist Historical Soc. xii (1936), 297-311

Davis, Elizabeth, J., The Transformation of London, Tudor Studies, ed. R.W. Seton-Watson (1924), 287-314

Fincham, F.W.X., Notes from the ecclesiastical court records at Somerset House. Trans. of Royal Hist. Soc. 4th series, iv (1921), 103-139

Fowler, R.C., Secular Aid for Excommunication, Trans. of Royal Hist. Soc. 3rd. series, viii (1914), 113-119

Hill. C., Puritans and the Poor, Past and Present, No.2 (Nov.1954)

Hockaday, F.W. The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester, Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Soc. xivi (1924), 197-287

Jenkin, C., Act Book of the archdeacon of Taunton, 1623-4, Somerset Rec. Soc. xliii (1928 1-177

Kaye, W.J., Yorkshire Notes, An Ecclesiastical Summary of the Province and Diocese of York in 1603, The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, xxxi (1934), 421-2

Lacey, T.C., The Ecclesiastical Habit in England, Trans. of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Soc. iv, 126-34

Major, Kathleen, Resignation Deeds of the Diocese of Lincoln, Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xix (1942/3), 57-65

Mathew, D., Wales and England in the Early Seventeenth Century, Trans. of the Hon. Soc. of Cymmodorion, (1955), 36-49

Notes and Queries, 1st. series, xii (1855), 443

Price, F.D., The Elizabethan apparitors in the diocese of Gloucester, Church Quarterly Review, 134 (1942), 37-55.

Price, .D., The Abuse of Excommunication and the Decline of Ecclesiastical Discipline under Queen Elizabeth, English Historical Review, lvii (1942), 106-15

Rich, E.E., The Population of Elizabethan England, Economic History Review, 2nd.series, ii, No.3 (1950), 245-65

Times Literary Supplement, Sept.16th, 1955

Tindal Hart, A., Unlearned and Ignorant Men, Church Quarterly Review, No.323, clviii (195€ 190-6

Williams, Dorothy, Puritanism in the City Government 1610-40, Guildhall iscellany, No.4 (Feb. 1955), 3-14

D. Unpublished Theses

Ashby, E.G., Some Aspects of Parish Life in the City of London 1429-1529 (M.A. London 1950)

Babbage, S.B., The Church of England and Puritanism during the Primacy of Bancroft 1604-1610 (Ph.D. London 1941)

Barratt,Mollie D., The Condition of the Parish Clergy between the Reformation and 1660, with special reference to the dioceses of Oxford, Worceste and Gloucester (D.Phil. Oxford 1949)

Collinson, P., The Puritan Classical Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth I (Ph.D. London 1 57)

Donaldson, G., The Relations Between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604 (Ph.D. London 1938)

Gabriel, R.C., Members of the House of Commons 1586-7 (M.A. London 1954)

Mildon, W.M., Puritanism in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight from the reign of Elizabeth to the Restoration (Ph.D. London 1934)

Mullins, E.L.C., The Effects of the Marian and Elizabethan Religious Settlements Upon the Clergy of London, 1553-1564 (M.A. London 1948)

Wilson, Jean S., The Administrative Work of the Lord Chancellor in the Early Seventeenth Century (Ph.D. London 1927)

Wood, N., Religious Uniformity and English Education in the Sixteenth Century (Ph.D. London 1928)